
THE INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY

October

M D C C C C I V

AN INTERPRETATION OF RUSSIAN AUTOCRACY VLADIMIR G. SIMKOVITCH

THE Russian Autocratic System is now facing a more serious trial than ever in its past. The present war, while diverting public attention for the moment, can not change to any material extent, the course of Russia's inner development. In fact, it is more likely to hasten the crisis. The system is breaking down and the day when it will be abandoned ought to be a day of praise and thanksgiving not only for the people, but also for the Tsar, for Russian Autocracy has not only brought the country to the verge of ruin and starvation, but it has also ruled Tsar Nicholas II. with a rod of iron, and out of a man of noble motives and high ideals it has made a pathetic figurehead suffering under the weight of the inherited system.

Prince Ukhtomski, an old friend of Tsar Nicholas II., whose patriotism and loyalty are beyond question has summed up the situation in the following words:

"Russia is chronically starving, pauperism increases in extent and degree and there are neither ways nor means either to stop or to mitigate this evil. Expenditure is growing on all sides and in all directions without bounds, but the sources of productive labor are exhausted. The people in the country, young and old, labor with all their force, but all their exertions do not suffice to satisfy the requirements of the state and of those who live on the labour of the peasants. . . . There is but one way towards a brighter future and that is the delivery of the people from the yoke of bureaucracy." (St. Petersburgskia Vedomosti, November 13th, 1901).

But it is not bureaucracy as such, it is the specific spirit of the Russian bureaucracy, it is the point of view, the doctrinaire, sinister Byzantinism, the system of Alexander III., of Pobedonosceff, Katkoff, Leontyeff, etc., that has gradually led Russia to moral and material degeneration. Nicholas II., a man of an entirely different make-up, could not free himself from the established system and from the statesmen it had produced. And yet Alexander III. and Katkoff, and Leontyeff and Pobedonosceff, etc., were all, perhaps, with the exception of Katkoff—perfectly honest men who sincerely and unselfishly worked for what they considered the salvation of Russia. Alexander III. witnessed the terrible death of his father, the great reformer, and this event forced him back to the severe absolutism of Nicholas I. But under Nicholas I. Russia was a part of Europe. Autocracy was a fact, but not a doctrine. Only under Alexander III., only after the experiences at the Berlin Congress of 1878 absolutistic Russia felt conscious of being fundamentally different from Western Europe; it felt that it might indeed have in common with some western states the divine right of kings, and yet became conscious of the abyss that separated Europe from Russia.

The Slavophiles and Panslavists rejoiced over the spirit in which Alexander III. determined to govern Russia. But there was no cause for such a rejoicing. Only a distorted selection of points acceptable to a Tsar and pernicious to a people were taken over from the Slavophile code and fused with a system of government, in its spirit and origin more Tartar than Slavonic.

But *what* is this System? There is nobody who represents and interprets its spirit more correctly and more fearlessly than Nikolay Konstantinovich Leontyeff. Leontyeff himself is often regarded as the last great Slavophile publicist, but this is a mistake. He represents precisely the peculiar fusion of degenerate Slavo-Philism with Russian governmentalism which is the spirit and principle of the reign of Alexander III. and which is present day Russia's inheritance and "System."

But let the philosopher of the System speak for himself.¹ Let us begin with underlying principles, with his theory.

"Byzantinism" is the basic principle. Byzantinism is the nervous system of Russia. It stands for something very definite; politically it is Autocracy, religiously it is Christianity with very distinct features, which allow no confusion with western churches and with the teachings of heretics and dissenters. In matters of morals it does not share the western exaggerated notions of the value and importance of human personality. The Byzantine

¹ Leontyeff develops his philosophy in his famous work, "Vostok, Rossia and Slovyanstvo" (i.e., The East, Russia and the Slavs), 2 volumes, Moscow, 1885.

ideal is discouragement in regard to everything earthly, including personal happiness, personal purity and the possibility of personal moral perfection in general (Vol. I, p. 81). Russian Autocracy, Russian Tsarism developed under Byzantine influences. Byzantine ideas were the only elements in common among such widely differing parts of the Russian Empire as Little Russia, Lithuania and Great Russia (I. 98-99). Byzantine Christianity teaches strict subordination, it teaches that the worldly, the political hierarchy is but the reflection of the heavenly hierarchy. There is no equality, because the church teaches that even angels are not equal among themselves (II. 41).

Christianity is the surest and most practical means of ruling the masses of the people with an iron hand. But this power only true Christianity has, the Christianity of the peasants, the monks and the nuns, not the Christianity *à l'eau de rose* with its talk about love without fear, about the dignity of men and the good of mankind (II. 48). Love of mankind is anthropolatry and is un-Christian. Fear is the basis of true faith. Everybody can comprehend fear, fear of punishment here and hereafter, and who fears is humble, and who is humble seeks authority and learns to love the authority above him (II. 268-269). And authority is constructive, is organizing. Organization, social organization, is by nature nothing else than chronic despotism, which is accepted by all in the organization; by some out of love, by others out of fear, or for the benefit they derive from this despotism. True constructive progress lies therefore in limiting freedom and not authority (II. 288). Freedom and liberalism are what is disintegrating countries. Slowly but surely they destroy their national existence. Liberalism is everywhere an enemy to the historical principles of the people, of the discipline in which the people developed. Liberalism is everywhere negative; it is the negation of all discipline. And the more honest, the more sincere, the more incorruptible is this liberalism—the more pernicious it is (II. 37).

Freedom for freedom's sake, habeas corpus, legality, the principles of 1789, "*le bien-être matériel et moral de l'humanité.*" . . . "O, these miserable ideals. These miserable men. . . . And the more sincere, the more honest, the more convinced they are, the worse, the more harmful they are in their naïve moderation, in their imperceptible progress and fatal insidiousness. It is awkward to punish them, to persecute them, to execute them. . . . Entrenched behind legal safeguards they are more dangerous than arrant knaves, against whom every country has the sword, the penitentiary, exile." . . . (Vol. II., page 40). Liberalism is a new idolatry that sacrifices nations, with their historical national peculiarities and characteristics, to a new idol, to a new and strange faith in the dignity and the rights of the

common European bourgeois. (II. 100). The Liberal is a half-nihilist, but more dangerous, because he does not dare to fight openly. He breathes safely under the uniform of a state official, in the professor's chair, on the judge's bench and especially in the clever and cunning articles of the liberal papers, which know at the proper time how to safeguard themselves with patriotic yells, with monarchistic exclamations, so that the hiss of the serpent and his treacherous coiling may not be noticed. (II. 109).

"Prepare, O, honest citizens, prepare the future! Teach your children to grumble against authorities, teach them that above all it is important to be an 'honest man' and that a man may have any religion he pleases. . . . Teach them to call piety bigotry, and to object to religious fanaticism, teach them that devotion to the Tsar's service and respect to superiors is servility. . . . Teach them not to care '*en principe*' for offices and decorations. . . . Prepare, prepare the future! Send immediately anatomical atlases to the public schools, so that the children of the peasant, these citizens of the beautiful future, may learn soon that there is no soul in a man, and that everything is nerves and nerves. . . . (and if there is nothing but nerves—why should they go to confession, or obey the policeman?) . . . Take special care that common people should not think that the earth stands on three whales! . . . O, refined, slow poison is more terrible than fire and sword" (II. p. 44-45).

All such doctrines, such innovations have to be nipped in the bud, otherwise they are victorious. Their positive side for the most part remains a castle in the air, but their destructive activity unfortunately too often achieves its negative end.

For the perfect destruction of what is left of the former social organization of Europe there is no need for barbarians, for a foreign invasion. The further spread of the religion of Eudaimonism with its device "*Le bien-être matériel et moral de l'humanité*"—will accomplish it! (I. 183).

The general *profession de foi* of the Russian interpreter of Autocracy is clear, and it might as well be pointed out that all these opinions were shared by Katkoff, Pobedonosceff, as well as by the late Emperor Alexander III. Let us now penetrate a little further into this doctrine that has for over two decades ruled Russia.

The Russian Tsar by his authority and according to the fundamental laws of the Empire has the right to do everything except to limit his authority. The Autocrat can not cease to be an autocrat. (II. 164). Anything that the Tsar does is good and legal, his doings can not be judged by the merits of the case; the pleasure of the Supreme Authority, the Tsar, is the supreme criterion. And he who can not reason so and can not understand

it, may be under circumstances in his private affairs an honest man; but he is not a true Russian. (II. 51). The Manifesto of Emperor Alexander III. of April 29th, 1881, was a true Russian Manifesto; in the face of the whole of constitutional Europe and the whole of republican America the Emperor declared that Russia did not intend to live any longer with somebody's else brains, and that from now on Autocracy would rule in Russia supremely and fearfully ("grozno") and even a dream of a constitution would not be tolerated. (I. 283). The duty of the conservative elements is not to be ashamed of calling themselves reactionaries (II. 79), because a reaction is necessary in Russia. There has been too much freedom. A violent rule is what the country needs. Violence, when there is a doctrine behind it, convinces many and conquers all. (II. 80). A violent rule is what the true Russian ought to love and the Russian peasant does so; he likes officials that are brilliant, bold, hard, even harsh. Bishops, generals, military commanders not only are esteemed by the peasant, but they please and appeal to his Byzantine feelings. . . . He loves decorations and looks at them with an almost mystical respect. . . . But the present nobility! Even a Gambetta and a Bright would appeal to them more than a Muravieff or Paskevitch. (II. 130). The higher classes are already infected. Russia is surrounded with this liberal pest. And immediate action must be taken against equality and liberalism. . . . *Russia must be kept frozen that it may not grow putrid.* (II. 86). Russia's illiteracy is therefore Russia's good fortune (II. 9). Since the Crimean war everything has tended to Europeanize Russia, and if she has been saved from this fate it is due to the common people and to a large extent to their illiteracy. But let a man dare straightforwardly and sincerely to doubt the value of public schools! Let a man say that it is still very questionable if it is necessary or truly useful to teach the people, the liberals would laugh at him. But is it really advisable to propagate among the people European notions, tastes, ideals, prejudices and terrible mistakes?" (II. 133).

Almost as pernicious as the schools are the new courts of justice as established by Alexander II. They have undermined all authority. They have publicly attacked and convicted statesmen, abbots, barons, generals, mayors of cities and men and women of quality. . . . And the public was glad. The introduction of the new courts and the jury system was an extremely radical step, and to maintain an equilibrium the judges ought to interpret the new institutions properly, and favor the older elements, the generals, the abbots, the nobleman, the fathers and mothers as against the younger and weaker elements. The weaker element may soon become too strong! We must not disaccustom the people and the youth to obedience;

it is against the spirit of Greek Orthodoxy, in which the Monarchy has grown up. Without talking much about it aloud, the present courts therefore must be modified.² (II. 136-142).

The great cardinal problem for Russian interior administration as well as for Russian foreign policy is how to weaken democracy. "How to weaken, how to strangle democracy, Europeanism, liberalism in all countries—that is the question!" (I. p. 301). Whosoever wishes Russia well must desire the ruin of western civilization and of the foremost nations representing this civilization. This western civilization is already going to pieces, but it has not yet lost its charm for the majority of the cultured people of Russia who are still naïve enough to believe in "democracy and the welfare of humanity" (I. 305). On the suppression of liberalism depends the outcome of the solution of the Eastern question.³

Panslavism is a necessity, but if Greek-Orthodox Panslavism is salvation, liberal Panslavism means ruin and first of all for Russia! (I. 267); because all the Slavs outside of Russia are Europeans and liberals. If Greek Orthodoxy is still strong in the East it is due to the Turks. The Turkish oppression was the only preservative that saved the Balkan Slavs from the destructive influences of European liberalism.

Russia's true national policy can not be based on purely racial considerations. It is the spiritual idea that is Russia's strength, and this idea is Greek Orthodoxy and Autocracy. One may talk anything "for Europe," but one must think logically and clearly for oneself. The existence of Turkey is beneficial to Russia, so long as she is not ready to take its place on the Bosphorus. A Pasha is better than a Greek democratic Nomarch (prefect); the Pasha is more autocratic, more statesmanlike. (II. 255). Racial sympathies should not mislead any Russian, and as a matter of fact it may as well be pointed out that among all the Slavonic nations, Russia is the least Slavonic. Russia is different in her history and her composition, different psychologically and intellectually, from all other Slavs. "Russia is the most easterly, the most, so to say, Asiatic Turanian nation in the Slavonic world, and she can develop quite independently of Europe. Without this Asiatic influence of Russia the other Slavs would soon become most miserable continental Europeans and nothing else, and for such a miserable end it is not worth their while to 'shake off their yoke' or for us to undertake self-sacrificing crusades." (I. 285). In the Russian make-up are strong and important characteristics that resemble more the Turks, the Tartars,

² And this has indeed taken place.

³ Leontyeff was a great authority on eastern affairs, having spent over ten years in Turkey in Russian diplomatic service.

the Asiatics rather than the southern and western Slavs. The Russians are lazier, more fatalistic, more obedient to authority, more good-natured, more recklessly brave, more inconsistent and infinitely more inclined to religious mysticism than the Servians, Bulgarians, Czechs or Croatians. (I. 284).

The tendencies of the Southern Slavs are evil; they are worse even than the Frenchman. The French nation has at least checking traditions, it still has royalists, ultramontanes, it has aristocrats, it has feudal traditions that keep it from a democratic disintegration. The Slavs on the other hand are throughout liberals, constitutionalists, democrats. They have no ground under their feet that develops men of thought and authoritative conservatism. I. 307). But is it not Russia's great destiny to unite all the Slavs? This destiny is a dangerous burden, it is a sad necessity; it may mean the downfall of autocratic Russia exchanged God knows for what. The Slavs are fundamentally different from old Russia of the Kremlin of Moscow. Take Bulgaria, for instance. Its cultured classes are of the most common European liberal stamp. And what harm these cultured Bulgarians have already done to Russia and their own people! No, Bulgaria is not misguided, it is calculating and bold, it is a fatal and dangerous nation!

Why then unite ourselves with these nations that are to such an extent liberal and constitutional? Why bother Turkey, which by its very existence is so useful to us in checking this great European pestilence, that is called democratic progress! (II. 67). And this last Turkish war . . . the Russian Army crossing the Danube, the Russian Army passing the Balkans. . . . The victorious army standing before Constantinople. . . . And yet it did not enter it, it did not occupy it! It looks like an evident weakness, like a blunder. . . . But it was, as God views it, right. "In that year we were still unworthy to enter there, we should have spoiled everything. . . . We were then still *too liberal!*"* (II. 261) The final repulsion of the Turks is necessary, but in taking their place we ought not to have in view the "liberty" of the Christians, but their *organization*. And we, therefore, must by all means clear our own as well as their minds from all sorts of constitutional and liberal likings, customs and tastes. Otherwise we shall ruin our own future as well as the future of the East. And when the time comes to expel the Sultan, we will not expel him because he is an autocratic Asiatic monarch (that is good!), but because he has become too weak and he can not any longer resist the liberal European influences. *But Russia can if it wants to! Russia has proved that it can.* It proved it by the Manifesto of the Emperor Alexander III. of the 29th of April, 1881. (I. p. 282-283). And for the present Russia must

*The Turkish war was in the liberal reign of Alexander II.

keep in mind the old principle; *divide et impera!* It is essential for Russia that on the Balkan peninsula there shall be as little as possible of state-unity, of political harmony and as much as possible of church-unity, of Greek-orthodox unity. Russia's friends are the Greek Patriarchs, the Greek monks, the Montenegro warriors; the Russian enemies, the enemies of the church, enemies of Russian Autocracy are the parliaments of Greece and of the Balkan States (I. 226-230).

The South-Slavonic bourgeoisie stands in the way of a Russo-Byzantian autocratic Empire. Russia has to reckon with this class and *must* change or neutralize it. Russia must find some powerful antidote for the miserable European liberalism. And for the time being the only and the best available antidote is the nursing and strengthening of the Greek-orthodox Church in the Balkan States. (I. 230).

As it is now, western diplomacy is already trying to diminish Russian influence in Greece and Bulgaria and from the experience of the past it can be foreseen what it would be if Constantinople should become something like an absurd neutral city. All this motley self-seeking and irritable population of Christian Turkey will be left to its passions without the Russian friendly but fatherly-severe "veto!" To see Constantinople a free European town is to see it directly and indirectly closed and inaccessible for Russia. (I. 255).

The other danger is still greater. Russia may become contaminated, may catch the disease from the Southern Slav, whom she is warming at her bosom. The Russians like the Frenchmen may learn to love any kind of Russia as the Frenchmen has learned to serve any sort of France. But who could care for a Russia that is not autocratic and not Greek-orthodox! (II. 149). And because Katkoff for decades has preached this doctrine he deserves a monument during his lifetime.

But the great truth is that Russia has already caught the disease. In the bottom of their hearts the Russians are already liberal. They do not realize that it is simply a *sin* to love Europe. (II. 306). Yes, during recent years the Russian people has shown that its character is becoming very doubtful if not exactly bad. It seems that sooner or later the common people will follow the intelligent leaders. And these intelligent ones are throughout liberal *i. e.*, empty, negative and unprincipled. (II. 182).

But what then can save a country in such a condition? The answer is *inequality*. The more equal the rights, the more similar are the subjects of the empire, and the more similar are their demands. *Divide et impera!* is therefore not a piece of Jesuitism, but it is a law of nature, a fundamental principle of good government. So long as there are different castes, different

provinces, with different peoples, so long as the education is different in different classes of society, then there is still a good chance to fight democratic progress. (Vol. I. 165). But if the equalizing tendencies of Liberalism and the democratic spirit gain the upper hand then there is only one salvation left—and that is the conquest of new and original countries, the conquest and occupation of new territories with a foreign and dissimilar population, the annexation of countries that carry in themselves conditions favorable for autocratic discipline, an annexation that does not hurry with any deep or inner assimilation. (I. p. 171-179). *Divide et impera!*

II.

We have presented the interpretation of the Russian system of government as firmly adhered to by Alexander III., and as illustrated by all his administrative activity. The closing lines of the last chapter throw, perhaps, some light on the occupation of Manchuria and on the causes of the present war. But the Russian people is clamoring not for Manchuria, but for its daily bread and such safe-guards of personal liberty as the Anglo-Saxons have secured in their Magna Charta.

When Nicholas II. succeeded his father, a sigh of relief went through Russia. It was expected that he would revert to the policy of his grandfather, that he would grant some sort of conservative constitution, which Alexander II. was about to sign, when he was murdered. But all these hopes failed. Nicholas II. was too weak a man to take a step of any importance whatsoever, the numerous petitions of provincial assemblies of the nobility praying for guarantees of life, liberty and property, were answered by arrests and exiles, and the Tsar solemnly declared on January 17th, 1895, that he would rule in the spirit of his father, and no change in the system, no "foolish dreams" would be tolerated.

The Tsar has kept his word. But he did not rule, he does not rule, and Russia is drifting towards rack and ruin, still in the grip of the same all-powerful System, with a thoroughly good but helpless Tsar as its first slave, and perhaps its last victim. Not restrained by a responsible man, in the hands of a motley body of advisers, who have none of the honesty and integrity and unselfishness of fanatics like Alexander III. or Pobedonosceff, the autocratic system of Alexander III. has become more unscrupulous than ever. Bezobrazoff and Alexeyeff are plunging Russia into a terrible and unnecessary war and the ministry of von Plehve has managed Russia, attending chiefly to the extermination of the "inner foe," i.e., the enlightenment of the Russian people.

But the crimes of government are interpreted by foreigners as the bar-

barism of the people, and the fair name of Russia is disgraced throughout the world. The opinion of the average American is that the Russian people is barbarous and its government enlightened. But he forgets that it is not the government but the people that has produced the great Russian artists, the great Russian novelists, the great Russian scholars famous throughout the world. The Russian people produced them not with the help, but in spite of the autocratic government. Were not the two greatest Russian poets, Pushkin and Lermontoff, harassed and persecuted by the governments? Did not Turgeneff live in exile in Europe? Was not Dostoyevski sentenced to death, his punishment being commuted on the scaffold to forced labor in Siberia? Was not Tolstoy anathematized, and is it not an open secret that he would long ago have been sent to Siberia were it not for the bad impression such an action might have produced on Europe?

Was it the Russian people that drowned 6,000 innocent Chinese men, women and children in the Amoor; or was it the troops obeying with horror orders received? But what is Russia's good name to its government? As Prince Gregory Volkonski correctly says, the one thought and care of the Russian government is that the power shall not slip out from its hands.⁵ But this slipping out process has already begun. The Autocratic System still exists in its irresponsibility, but it is not any longer in the hands of the autocrat. The imperial mantle is already being pulled to shreds and pieces, and there is a constant scramble between grand dukes and common climbers and intriguers for the most of it. Did the autocrat of all the Russias want this war? Did he not state to the Japanese Minister in all sincerity that there would be no war? Did he not order Alexeyeff to transmit on New Year's Day to the Far Eastern troops his imperial greetings and his assurance that peace would be preserved in the Far East? And nobody doubted the good faith of the Tsar, but everybody in Japan and elsewhere was convinced of the bad faith of the Imperial Russian Government, of its Machiavellian sixteenth-century methods of diplomacy, and the world is tired of it. Honest straightforward methods in international dealings may weigh on some governments as a nightmare, but they will have to conform to them.

And now to the last—we hope the last—great crime of the Autocratic System. For what is Russian blood now sacrificed and billions of rubles wrung from the starving Russian people, wasted on the fields of Manchuria? Does the Russian people need Manchuria? Not in the least. Even such expansionists and nationalistic papers as Suvorin's "Novoe

⁵ Prince Gregory Volkonsky. "The Present Condition of Russia" (in Russian), Stuttgart, 1903, p. 23.

Vremya" and Prince Ukhtomski's "St. Petersburgskia Vedmosti" were bitterly opposed to it. But who cares for national interests, when personal are at stake! In Corea a company formed by a couple or more of grand dukes, and some higher bureaucrats has obtained valuable lumber and mining concessions—a sufficient cause for declaring northern Corea under the Russian sphere of influence.⁶ As to the Manchurian adventure, everybody in Russia knew perfectly well and talked freely about this new promised land for official thieves. It is estimated that about three-quarters of the hundreds of millions appropriated for the railroads, the new commercial cities, the ports, etc., were stolen, and the money went high enough up to interest a powerful element of the autocratic administration in perpetuation of this new Eldorado.

Already in the beginning of 1902 Professor Migulin of the University of Kharkoff,⁷ a very conservative man and an expert in railroad finance, called attention to what was going on in Manchuria. The railroad afforded no technical difficulties whatsoever, the Chinese coolie-labor used on the railroad was the cheapest in the world, the material used was imported duty-free, and yet the laying of rails alone (not counting equipment, cost of stations, platforms, etc.) cost the government more than 152,000 rubles *pro verst*, *i. e.*, about 230,000 rubles a mile!⁸ Professor Migulin then also pointed out that Manchuria on account of its extremely cheap coolie-labor is a place entirely unfit for Russian colonization, and likely to kill agriculture and colonization in the Russian Amoor-region, since Russians can not compete with Chinese wages and the low prices of the agricultural products.

Prince Ukhtomski, the president of the Russo-Chinese Bank and formerly an intimate friend of Nicholas II., in an interview granted to the correspondent of the "Frankfurter Zeitung" did not hesitate to acknowledge that the cause of this war is "graft."

"Whose fault is it, in the opinion of Your Highness, that affairs have taken such a course?"

"In the present episodes the fault is entirely with Japan, which wants the war, is prepared for the war, which hates Russia and is full of warlike

⁶ Osvoboshdenie, No. 31, p. 118.

⁷ P. P. Migulin. "Our Latest Railroad Policy and Railroad Loans (1901-1902)," Kharkoff, 1902.

⁸ The Manchurian railway cost the Russian people \$115,000 per mile, while the average cost of an American railway in the Western plains is \$13,000 to \$15,000 a mile. The inspecting engineer for the U. S. Government estimated, in 1887, the cost of reproduction of the Central Branch of the Union Pacific R.R. at \$20,040 a mile; and it must be remembered that in the intervening twenty years the track and roadbed had been put in a much better condition than at the time of original construction. See Reports of the U. S. Pacific Railway Commission, Senate Executive Documents, 50th Congress, 1st Session, No. 51, pp. 4437-4468.

enthusiasm. But in general of course such a situation would never have arisen if we had adhered to a policy of civilization rather than to promoters' politics."

"What do you mean by promoters' politics?"

"O, there are plenty of people that are interested in the innumerable millions appropriated for the railroads, etc. The 'Chunchuses' (Manchurian Brigands) and the 'rainstorms' have so fantastically complicated the work, so fantastically increased the expenses, that really without being especially suspicious, one can not help seeing how things were managed there." (Osvoboshvenie N. 41, p. 302).

These immediate appetites are the immediate little causes of the war, but not the fundamental cause. This great cause is pointed out by Leontyeff. It is the thirst for the Asiatic continent which carries in itself conditions so favorable to a perpetuation of the Russian Autocracy in *saecula saeculorum*. Manchuria with its millions of strong warlike people means a tremendous additional strength, it means a great step in the realization of this dream. And will this dream be realized? Certainly not in the light in which the Russian autocracy sees it. Theoretically it may be a very pretty scheme of checking the progress of Russian civilization, with the help of Cossacks, Turkomen and Manchurian hordes. But the time-element was entirely left out of consideration. It takes no prophet to foresee that the Russian people will finish with the autocratic régime long before it possibly can take a new lease of life in Asia. And the present war is only hastening the crisis. Even such an optimistic and staunch advocate of autocracy as Prince Meshcherski takes up with the rôle of a Cassandra and does not expect the war to be a beneficial thunder-storm that will clear the atmosphere for the Russian autocracy. On the contrary, no matter if the Russian arms are eventually victorious, a terrible economic decline is bound to follow, when all the little rivulets and channels of dissatisfaction will unite in a sea of general dissatisfaction⁹; and then, we may confidently add, the real regeneration of Russia will begin.

⁹"Grashdanin," of December 31, 1903.

SOCIALISM AT THE PARTING OF THE WAYS

WOLF VON SCHIERBRAND.

SOMETHING over a twelvemonth ago the Socialist party in Germany achieved a sweeping victory in the general Reichstag elections, increasing its vote by nearly a million (from 2,170,000 to something over 3,000,000) and its membership in the national Parliament from 63 to 82. The fact of this great accession to the ranks of Socialism sufficed nearly all political writers outside of the Empire (and indeed many within) to predict the rapid metamorphosing of Germany into a Socialistic commonwealth. And the prophecy seemed not unreasonable.

There had been a steady growth in the voting strength of German Socialism. The strength of the party rose, with but a single interruption, from 150,000 in 1869, to twenty times that number, all within the space of 34 years. The Socialist press, from small beginnings, became a factor seriously to be reckoned with by the imperial government. Viewed merely as a political party organ this press is to-day the most numerous and influential of all, influential not alone in swaying proletarian opinion, but also in measurably affecting all the other strata of German society, directly or indirectly. No other single political journal in the Empire is so dreaded as the "Vorwärts," the leading Socialist paper in Berlin. Accessions to the Socialist party came from every rank and from every political organization. It drew its recruits very largely from the various factions of the Liberal party, but adhesions came also from the camp of their political antipodes, the Conservatives and the Centrists (or Catholic Ultramontanes), and university professors and lecturers, as well as army officers, government officials and wealthy bankers or manufacturers, joined the serried proletarian cohorts. Dr. Arons, a lecturer at Berlin University, and a nephew of the multimillionaire banker, Baron Bleichröder, regularly contributed no small share to the Socialist campaign and party funds, for which the "Vorwärts" never failed to make public acknowledgment. Again, no other political party in Germany has shown the same splendid organization, cohesion or self-sacrificing enthusiasm.

Is it a wonder that when the election returns came in, in midsummer of 1903, blind terror struck every non-Socialist, from the Kaiser down to the merest "beer-bench" philistine? Is it strange that much talk was heard, even in Germany, of the near fulfilment of the Socialist hopes?

But in politics, more frequently perhaps than in other phases of public life, the unexpected happens. As things have been shaping themselves within

the past year, it seems almost safe to say that the general elections of 1903 have marked the high tide of Socialism in Germany and that, in all likelihood—unless, indeed, enormous blunders are made by the Kaiser and his government—this party, as a political unit, will never again demonstrate the same degree of strength. Let us calmly survey the facts as they present themselves at this writing.

Of course, the phenomenal Socialist success at the polls was bound to provoke a reaction. First, the motto was given out for all the non-Socialistic parties, to consolidate and present a united front on all occasions when facing the common enemy—Socialism. This movement, though not invariably successful nor as well organized as might be, has nevertheless been steadily gathering momentum, and the results thus far achieved are becoming evident. Thus, owing to death, resignation or other circumstances, eight of the eighty-two Socialist seats in the Reichstag became vacant within one year. Of the by-elections thus made necessary the Socialists have lost five, reducing their delegation in the present Reichstag session to seventy-seven. Three of these defeats were brought about in towns recently considered Socialist strongholds. Again, at other by-elections in electoral districts where the Socialist vote heretofore was large enough to make a contest worth while the Socialists were not only defeated, but in every instance showed considerable loss in votes, when compared with former years.

The opposition to Socialism has, moreover, spread to every political party, including the various factions of the Liberal party. For the most radical of these, the *Freisinnige Vereinigung* (Radical Association), of which Dr. Theodore Barth is the leader, and the South German democratic *Volkspartei* (People's Party), have in their majority become outspokenly anti-Socialistic, though formerly there was much fraternizing between them and the Socialists. Dr. Barth and several other Liberal leaders have vainly striven to counteract this movement. Under the panic fear of ultimate Socialist domination all the Liberal factions—the National Liberals, the *Volkspartei* and the two organizations under the leadership of Dr. Barth and Eugene Richter—have made common cause with their former most formidable foes, the Conservative and the Centre (or Ultramontane) parties, even in cases where it has been necessary to abandon their own party platforms. This feature of the matter is regrettable, for it means the complete submerging of Liberalism in the Empire, and the undisputed predominance of reactionary and agrarian interests. Never in the history of the reunited Empire has reactionism been as strong as it is today, and this is true not only of Prussia, but of the whole country. A striking proof of this may be found in the adoption by a large majority of the so-called School Com-

promise resolution in the Prussian Diet, a measure so frankly retrogressive in public education that ten years ago it would have been deemed impossible in Germany. By this measure the public school system in Prussia passes once more, bound hand and foot, under the control of the two state churches, the Evangelical and the Catholic, according to the district in which each school is located. The same result has been accomplished in Bavaria and Saxony, while similar measures are under serious consideration in Württemberg, Baden and Hesse. This, as an incidental outcome of the fierce struggle against Socialism on which the nation itself—the electorate of the whole Empire—has now entered, shows that the era of easy successes has once more come to a close for the Socialist party.

Another remarkable feature of this anti-Socialistic reaction is the number of organizations that have sprung up of late in every part of the country. One of them, styled Reichsverband gegen die Sozialdemokratie (Imperial Anti-Socialist Association), within two months after its inception had attained a membership of nearly half a million. And among its organizers was the vice-president of the Reichstag, Dr. Paasche, as well as many other leaders of Liberalism. The chief purpose of this new body is popular enlightenment of the masses regarding the fallacies and pretenses of Socialism.

This, however, is not all. More dangerous for Socialism, far more dangerous than these outside foes, is the internal strife that is now disrupting its ranks. There is no longer any harmony between the sundry parts—differing very materially in creed—of the Socialist party in Germany. The different sections of this party have never agreed upon their tenets and ultimate purposes and upon the means calculated to realize them. From the first there have been many who voted the Socialist ticket not from conviction but as the best, indeed as the only, means to give expression to their discontent with prevailing conditions in the Empire. From the first there has been, so to speak, a party of moderates and extremists, of internationals and nationals, of monarchists and republicans, of men favoring active, forcible revolution, and of men advocating peaceful and natural evolution. The party has, therefore, existed and hung together for so many years by virtue of many and continual compromises between its component parts, a condition more or less true of any great political party.

But of late these differences have been so bitter that they have led to a complete estrangement between the various factions. The war between the "Old" and the "Young," between the "Irreconcilables" of the type of Bebel and Singer, and the "Moderates" around Bernstein and Vollmar, has been waged for years. It has regularly come to a focus at every national Socialist convention, but heretofore it has always ended in a compromise.

Now, however, the Bebel faction, at the national convention at Dresden, has signally and pitilessly triumphed over its foe. Edward Bernstein, the greatest intellectual leader the German Socialists have had since the days of Lassalle and Marx, has been shelved, apparently for good. When he, quite recently, came before his Socialist electorate for reelection, his own party defeated him and helped to elect a Conservative.

Now, Bernstein has done more than all other Socialists to wean away his party, during the past ten years, from the doctrine of establishing Socialism by force, that is, by bloody revolution and general expropriation. For the victorious wing of the party to ostracise and relegate to obscurity such a man, and with him all those who hold similar opinions, was a step bordering on party tyranny. The Bernstein wing, the "Moderates" or the "Young," as they are also called, is, however, too strong and numerous, and possesses too many organs of its own to be overcome. Bernstein himself is editor of the "Neue Zeit," the weightiest periodical published on Socialist lines, and several of his chief pupils are also conducting influential Socialist newspapers.

What the ultimate outcome of this split in the party will be it is impossible to foretell. For the time being the "Moderate" wing is holding aloof from party politics and strategy alike. The most widely read and outwardly the most influential of the Socialist organs, the "Vorwärts," is on the side of Bebel and the "Irreconcilables," and thus far their opponents have refrained from preaching formal rupture and the organization of a new "Reform" Socialist party. But it is difficult to see what else they can do. Even accepting the numerical strength of the "Moderates" at their adversaries' own valuation, they would represent two-fifths of the whole Socialist vote, considerably over a million, which is no negligible quantity.

The complete separation of these two bodies of Socialists and the forming of a new and independent organization would radically alter the whole political complexion for Germany. There would no longer be the overpowering dread of the huge and revolutionary mass of Socialists which now sways the average non-Socialist there, and one wing of Socialism would fairly neutralize the other on many branches of legislation. Indeed, it is very probable that such an event would lead to a regrouping of political parties within the Empire, and might bring quite unforeseen results, both in the Empire's domestic and foreign policy.

At any rate, it is quite evident that Socialism there has entered on a new phase of its existence.

It is a strange coincidence that Socialism had its rise when the present German Empire was formed. That which the best and ablest minds

of Germany had been dreaming of for generations had come to pass, and that, too, under peculiarly impressive circumstances. The country, after being disrupted and condemned to political impotency since 1806, was reunited under the sceptre of a self-chosen emperor, and there seemed every reason to look for a new era of power and prosperity. And yet, true as this is, when examining the attendant facts, it seems but natural that these very novel conditions should have bred Socialism in Germany. Germany's industrial rise dates only since 1870; so does her abundance of mobile capital, and the great gulf between rich and poor, between the toiler and the employer.

Then, again, the Liberal Party throughout Germany had been blind. They did not discern the fact that the "fourth estate"—i.e., the laboring classes—had fought on the barricades of 1848 for independent ideals of its own; that this portion of the population had particular interests, differing from those of the educated and well-to-do, but hitherto ignored, middle class; that the rapid growth of modern industry and the increasing consolidation of labor-employing capital necessarily meant the growth of a new factor in population and political life. The Liberal Party, once it had come to power after 1848, and become the dominating force in the Prussian Parliaments of 1854-1866, and, subsequently, in the Reichstag, from 1867-1878, had looked upon their humble helpers in politics, the horny-handed men of toil, as auxiliaries, not as independent allies; the reflection did not occur to them that this lower class could have political and economic desires apart from the Liberal programme. That programme contemplated, in the main, the firm establishment of Parliamentaryism in Germany; the emancipation from State restraint of commerce and manufacture, both in domestic and foreign dealings; the strict separation of State and Church. It was, therefore, largely modeled after the English prototype. But the laboring classes were not satisfied with these aims merely. They desired, on the contrary, the protection of the State in the exercise of their callings and handicrafts; they wanted the State to interfere for their benefit, in securing for them better terms than they could secure by individual effort from the employer. They wished, in a word, legislation designed specially for their class needs. That was, at first, as far as their political and economic horizon went.

If Liberalism had not been thus strangely blind in those early days of German industrialism, the period of 1850-1870, the "fourth estate" and the "third estate" could have amalgamated into one vast political army. And, under the general franchise—granted by Bismarck on the establishment of the North German Confederation, in 1867, and extended to the whole of Germany after the foundation of the Empire, on January 18, 1871,

—such an army would have been invincible, politically speaking. The whole political growth of the young Empire during the past thirty-three years would have been very different. Instead of the reactionary elements steadily gaining headway, until, after 1878, they became the ruling forces in its councils, a thoroughly modern, politically progressive nation and government would have resulted. The laboring classes would have been the leaven to liberalize, further and further, the “third estate”—the middle class.

However, this was not to be. While the Liberal party still harbored the delusion that their auxiliaries at the polls, the laboring classes, were merely their humble, unselfish friends, with no will and no desire of their own, a man arose who was the Moses to lead the children of pain and sorrow out of the wilderness toward the promised land of plenty. This was Ferdinand Lassalle. Born of well-to-do Jewish parents in Breslau, this man, in some respects one of the ablest Germany has ever produced, was a strange mixture of contradictory qualities. He had shown himself a forcible and original-minded writer on political and economic topics, and had at first affiliated with the radical wing of the Liberal party in Prussia, the Progressists (*Fortschrittspartei*). But both his ambition to be a real leader and the conviction that Liberalism would never voluntarily surrender a part of its power and programme to the masses below, impelled him to organize the laboring class into a separate political entity. He pondered much and long, and on March 1, 1863, in summoning a national German Labor Congress, for the first time gave form and substance to the indefinite longings of the industrial masses. His three agitational main paragraphs were at that time: ‘The dogma of the so-called “iron-clad wages law” (*ehernes Lohngesetz*), under the pressure of which, as he claimed, “from eighty-nine to ninety-six per cent. of Prussia’s population were groaning and starving;” the demand of a State credit of 100,000,000 thalers (about 72,000,000 dollars) for the founding of Productive Associations, yielding the employee part of the producers’ profits; and, lastly, general manhood suffrage, as in the United States.

With this programme, for which he spoke and wrote unceasingly, until the hour of his early death (he fell, in 1864, the victim of a foolish duel, from the bullet of *Racovitza*, a Roumanian nobleman), Lassalle rapidly made headway among the laboring element of Germany. It is of interest to note that in this he had Bismarck as an ally. Bismarck’s idea then was to use the liberated political forces of labor to hold in check the irksome power of the “third estate,” the middle class. It was the “*Conflictszeit*,” in the Prussian Diet, let us remember.

But now the whole trend of events changed. Lassalle had believed in and taught a social “*Volkskönigthum*,” that is, a national monarchy upheld

by and benefiting not alone the upper strata of society, but every class, including the "proletariat." The man whose teachings now superseded those of Lassalle taught, on the contrary, internationalism, revolution, forcible dispossession of the higher classes, and the consequent supreme rule of the lower classes. In a word, he inculcated that form of Social Democracy, so-called, which moulded the party of that name in Germany and elsewhere. This was Carl Marx, like Lassalle, of Jewish extraction, but, unlike him, a theorist, a thinker and philosopher, not a man of action, nor a born leader and politician. Exiled because of his extreme views, he lived, first, in Paris, and next in London. In London, too, he wrote his great work, "*Das Kapital*" (Capital), the gospel of modern Socialism.

In this work he built up that system of political and social economy, which soon became the creed of Socialism. He maintains that, as in the course of necessary evolution, Liberalism had killed Feudalism, establishing in lieu thereof Industrialism, so now the time was ripe for the masses of all nations, the "Proletariat," to defeat Industrialism, and put Socialism in its place. And by the latter term he meant the assumption and ownership by the State—or Commonwealth—of all means of production, distribution and communication. Industrialism, he argued, with uncontrolled production, caused regularly recurring economic crises and panics, leading to the rapid unsettling of economic conditions, and finally to intolerable impoverishment and universal misery. Above all, he insisted on the theorem of the "steady pauperization of the masses." Industrialism, as upheld by the "bourgeoisie," succumbs in the revolution which follows, and the Proletariat becomes its heir. Being in an overwhelming majority, the latter assumes the reins of government, and becomes the ruling power. All production henceforth proceeds on the communistic principle, and rewards and wages of labor are dealt out in the same spirit. Property as an individual factor in civilization ceases to exist.

There had been, prior to the appearance of this book, teachings more or less similar; some single paragraphs of Proudhon, Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Comte correlated with the whole system of Marx, but Marx laid chief stress on an economic upheaval, and "*Das Kapital*" carried arguments to their very last logical conclusions.

After Lassalle's death, Wilhelm Liebknecht and August Bebel continued systematic agitation among organized and unorganized labor in Germany. Liebknecht was a pupil of Marx, and Bebel soon after became so. At first, the Lassalle ideas and the Lassalle programme existed, as an independent and rather hostile factor, side by side with the labor party that followed Bebel and Liebknecht. The latter, in 1868, joined the Marx in-

ternational labor association, and formally adopted his theories. In 1869 the new Socialist party sent 262 delegates, representing 150,000 workingmen and mechanics, to a German party convention. In May, 1875, the Lassallites and the Marxites united and amalgamated at a national convention held in Gotha, and a regular party platform was adopted. This subsequently was modified, on the postulates of Carl Kautsky, at the convention of Erfurt, in the middle of the eighties. By 1874 the number of Socialist voters had already increased to 352,000, and they elected nine delegates to the Reichstag.

Bebel and Liebknecht were both able men, honest and enthusiastic in their faith in the Marx doctrine. Under their joint guidance the young Socialist party of Germany demonstrated their literal interpretation of "international fellowship" among the "Proletariat," by issuing, at the height of German successes on French battlefields, in 1870, a manifesto condemning the whole war and assuring the French "brethren" of their undivided sympathy. Later, for approving of the Commune uprising in Paris, early in 1871, both Liebknecht and Bebel were thrown into jail by the German Government. Nevertheless, Socialism steadily won new adherents, not only among the lower but also among the higher classes. The French war indemnity, the "milliards," pouring into Germany, had led there to a frantic dance around the Golden Calf, and later on to a severe industrial collapse. This also aided materially the Socialist cause.

Then came 1878. Twice the assassin's bullet sought the heart of venerable Emperor William I. Hödel was the name of one of these fanatics, and in his case Socialistic influences were traceable, while in that of the other, Dr. Nobiling, no such teaching could be shown. However, inflamed public opinion in Germany demanded condign punishment and severest restrictive measures. Under the impulse of indignation and blind terror, the newly elected Reichstag of that year passed bills putting Socialists outside the pale of the common law—the so-called *Ausnahmegesetz*, in force for twelve years. It was only in 1890, after Bismarck's retirement, that the Reichstag refused to sanction another renewal of this law. Under its workings scores of thousands of German Socialists were expelled from Germany, or jailed for longer or shorter terms, their party press closed, their political organization destroyed, their agitation made a criminal offense. On the surface at least Socialism in Germany seemed dead. But it had only been "scotched," and as subsequent events proved, had been harmonized and consolidated under persecution.

It is during the reign of the present Kaiser that Socialism has made the most rapid strides. With the over-confidence of youth and inexperience the

young monarch had said to Bismarck, shortly after his accession: "I will make short work of the Socialist movement—leave that to me!" Bismarck smiled his enigmatic smile for sole answer. The Socialists were then still living under the law specially aimed to destroy them as a political factor. They met the Kaiser's advances sullenly, scornfully. A few years later the Kaiser, baffled in his plans and out of all patience, at the opening of a new Reichstag session, in one of his uncontrolled bursts of fury, characterized the Socialists who thus defied him as "a horde of men unworthy to bear the name of Germans" (*eine Rotte Menschen, unwerth den Namen Deutsche zu tragen*), and the bitter saying ever since has made reconciliation impossible. In 1890 the obnoxious anti-Socialist law lost its effect, and the Socialists in doubled force reëntered the Reichstag and later other legislative or deliberative bodies. In 1893, at the next quinquennial election, there were cast 1,786,000 Socialist votes. At the succeeding general election, in 1898, their vote had risen to 2,117,000, and at the last one, in the summer of 1903, over 3,000,000 ballots were deposited for Socialist candidates, denoting—apparently at least—that a full third of the electorate of the Empire is made up of Socialists.

Numerically they are by far the largest party in Germany. It is true, they have at present only 77 delegates in the Reichstag, out of a total membership in that body of 397. But this is due to the fact that the election districts are still the same which were laid out in 1871, on the establishment of the Empire. The Socialists form to-day the majority of the population in nearly every large German city—above all, in Berlin, Hamburg, Breslau, Leipzig, Dresden, Nuremberg, Stettin, Dantzic, Königsberg, Altona, Chemnitz, Magdeburg. All these cities have grown enormously during the last thirty-three years, and if a reapportionment of the population into new election districts should ever be made, the result would be to almost double the phalanx of Socialists in the national Parliament. Incidentally, too, it would reduce the number of delegates on the Conservative side by fifty per cent. or more. That is why the present majority in the House (and with them the Government) stubbornly refuses to permit any redistricting.

Of course, it would be wide of the mark to attribute this increase in Socialist votes altogether to one or the other single factor. A number of influences have been simultaneously at work to accomplish this result. The phenomenally swift rise of Germany as an industrial and exporting centre is, perhaps, the most important of them. Between 1890 and 1900 Germany changed from a predominantly agricultural to a predominantly industrial and commercial country. Within that single decade the percentage of

agricultural population diminished from fifty-seven to forty-three; and the industrial and commercial population increased at just that ratio. German exports rose from 3,150 million marks in 1892 to 4,752 million in 1900, or from 776 to 1,185 million dollars—fully 53 per cent. Her mobile capital grew at even a more rapid rate. Unfortunately, however, the German “proletariat,” the “hand-to-mouth” population in the centres of trade, industry, shipping, increased at a greater rate than all.

Such a change necessitates in itself a complete shifting of the conditions of life, a transformation in the methods of production. This, again, must have a strong reflex effect on political life and on party groupings. In addition to that the character of the present Kaiser must be taken into account. Doubtless a man of a more conciliatory disposition, less headstrong, self-willed, impulsive and inconsiderate in his public criticisms of Socialism, a man not encouraging the floodtide of *lèse majesté* trials, but, on the contrary, minimizing them, would considerably contribute toward bringing about an era of better feeling between these two main parts of the population—the Socialist one-third and the non-Socialist two-thirds.

While on this theme it is worth while remarking that every attempt made by the German imperial government, or by the governments of the several sovereign states composing the Empire, to place again the Socialists *hors la loi*, or to discriminate politically against them, has been answered by the voters belonging to that party or by the German electorate body as a whole in an unmistakable way, namely, by a sudden swelling of the ranks of that party. This was notably the case in 1895, when, at the instance of the Kaiser, a new anti-Socialist bill was introduced in the Reichstag, practically outlawing the members of that party as such, and in 1898, when, again at the Kaiser's bidding, an anti-strike bill of draconian severity was presented. Both bills were defeated, and so was another of similar import in the Prussian Diet, and Socialist victories in previously unaffected election districts furnished a reply not to be misunderstood.

On the other hand, whenever, for any length of time, the Socialist party has been allowed to manage its own affairs, without let or hindrance, the natural consequence has been to promote and hasten the evolutionary process going on within its ranks. Perhaps, disintegration or “molting” (*Mau-serung*, as it has been termed in Germany) would better describe the process. And this is indeed the most interesting feature of this many-sided problem.

Despite occasional reaction, brought on by unwise or inopportune persecution or criticism, there has been within the Socialist party itself a steady transformation, differentiation and elimination. By admitting to its fold new and ever new hundreds of thousands, it necessarily gave political shelter

to numerous new shades and even varieties of thought. Granting that the one common bond for them all was dissatisfaction with present economic, social and political conditions in their country, there were many differing opinions as to the remedies best adapted to afford relief or a complete cure, and it is even doubtful if the orthodox Marxites would be in the majority were it ever to come to a fair test.

In the opening part of this article a brief summary is given of the present condition of the Socialist party in Germany. But beside the two main factions, that of Bernstein and of Bebel, there are other subdivisions. One of them, for example, is headed by George von Vollmar, for many years one of the leading Socialist members in the Reichstag. This man, a Bavarian, is by birth a member of the privileged classes, has independent means and served, during the war with France, as a brave and distinguished officer in the army, earning an Iron Cross of the first class for heroic conduct on the battlefield. A French bullet lamed him for life. While an invalid, slowly recovering from his several wounds, he happened to come across some Socialist literature which changed the whole current of his thought and convictions. He bade adieu to wealth and station, and turned a Socialist worker and agitator. But he is one of those Socialists who do not believe in discarding love and pride of country; nor does he advocate abolishment of the monarchical form of government, being convinced that a republic, to remain in working order, presupposes a decisive majority of republicans, men versed and firmly believing in self-government. He is consequently on very good personal terms with the Prince Regent of Bavaria.

There are, in short, Socialists and Socialists—men of creeds so varying one from the other that, if the party as a whole were given but a single decade of undisturbed development, it would be sure to fall to pieces, even if the present schism should be patched up. All that has so far kept it together is the stupidity and utter lack of political strategy of its opponents. Like every sect, persecution is what the party has fed and thriven on. Toleration would make something vastly different out of it.

The question may be asked: Has the Socialist party in Germany any legitimate function to perform?

The unbiased observer must reply with an emphatic Yes. The German laboring classes, whether Socialist or not, both in city and country, have a long and serious list of grievances. In no country of modern times are the relations between employer and employed so unsatisfactory. Caste spirit is very strong. The workingman is looked upon as the serf, the "thing" of the man whose bread he eats. He is, as a rule, treated harshly, often cruelly and brutally. Every attempt really to enforce the political, economic and

social rights conferred upon him by the constitution of the Empire or of Prussia, is discouraged, above all by the very power which ought to aid in enforcing them—the courts. The disadvantages under which the laborer suffers and groans are too manifold to be enumerated here. It is indeed necessary to remember the historic development of Germany in order to understand the low political and social status of the lower classes—the laboring man, the mechanic, the small shopkeeper, the farm hand. The only revolution that ever took place in Germany, that of 1848-49, proceeded from the middle classes, and had purely political reform for its aim. It was but partially successful, and when its waves had rolled back the condition of the lower classes was little changed. Even where the leaven of Socialism has worked, the laboring classes are still behind their fellows in countries of greater political freedom, where self-respect, maturity of convictions and sturdy independence are fostered. The lot of the rural laborer is hard beyond conception. And it is precisely the rural laborer who, for a number of reasons, which space forbids going into, has remained uninfluenced by Socialist agitation.

Socialism has acted and is acting to-day as the sole champion the workman possesses in Germany, and has accomplished for him, directly or indirectly, nearly every reform, benefit, improvement and other material or intellectual boon that has been put either on the statute books or into practical life during these last thirty years. It is this which gives Socialism its immense hold on the toiling millions of Germany, not the theoretical doctrines of Marx, Bebel or other leaders. These reasons, merely hinted at here—explain much. Socialism has had, I am firmly convinced, a salutary effect on the masses there. It has quickened the intellect of the worker, and has first enabled him to think, however faultily, on political and economic topics. It has, by organizing thousands of social clubs, given these whilom dull and torpid masses a genuine taste for and appreciation of purely æsthetic pleasures, such as music, singing, theatrical performances, concerts, and, above all, books. The Socialists in Germany have done what the government had left undone, viz., founded thousands of workmen's libraries. The Socialist press has in this respect done wonders. By the zeal and courage shown unfailingly in the Reichstag the Socialist contingent there has all along exerted a strong and very beneficial effect in the direction of social and economic reform. But there is another result achieved by Socialism in Germany worthy of mention. Socialism has stirred the sluggish public conscience. It is safe to say that Germany would not be to-day the foremost country in compulsory old-age, life, invalid and accident insurance if the Socialists had not agitated it for

years and literally forced the hand of Bismarck and the Kaiser. The clergy in Germany, both Protestant and Catholic, have begun to bethink them of one of their chief prerogatives, and now take once more an active interest in the lowly and poor, the ignorant and vicious—and this after a long period of indifference. A few years ago a young Protestant clergyman in Prussia, Paul Göhre by name, deliberately doffed his fine clothes and put on a rough blouse. He “went among the people,” worked, unrecognized, side by side with Socialist toilers, for six months. Then he returned to his own sphere of life and became an active political worker for social reforms. Pastor Naumann, another earnest-minded clergyman, after a somewhat similar experience, has founded the National Social Party. The so-called *Kathedersozialisten* (pulpit Socialists), a large and influential group of university professors, teachers, or private savants, of whom Prof. Schmoller, of Berlin University, is probably best known, are also an indirect fruit of Socialism. They and their writings and teachings have done a great deal both in disseminating knowledge among the educated classes of the actual conditions under which the working classes in Germany are living, and awakening a sense of the public obligation to hasten reforms. Of late, too, the wrongs of the rural laboring classes are being ventilated, and although years will elapse before the government will make up its mind to enforce reforms, needed among that class of the population even more urgently than for the toiler in town, a beginning in that direction has at least been made.

THE RELIGION OF AMERICA

EDWARD EVERETT HALE.

COTTON MATHER had the sense of humor, as greater men than he and lesser men than he have had. So it is to Cotton Mather that we owe the story, which is often brought out by writers on the religion of America—the story of an Essex County fisherman, who at the end of the seventeenth century, flung in his word as to the origin of New England. Some one at a religious meeting had been talking of the religious motive of the first planters, and one of the veterans of fourscore rose and said: “It was all this, and fish too.”

The story may or may not tell a fact, but it is a story well devised and contains the truth. Of the early American history, it is undoubtedly true that many men and women came to better their physical condition. But that is also true, which is not true of the first English settlers of Jamaica, of Australia, or of England—namely, that many men and women came among our first settlers because they sought a closer walk with God. Certainly this is true of Puritans in New England, of Quakers in Pennsylvania, of Catholics in Maryland, of Huguenots in Carolina. It is also true that these people, who had a distinctive religious purpose, had a very large agency in the history of the states where they settled. Whoever traces the history of those states finds that for a century, more or less, the presence of people who had come for religious motives visibly affects the status of either colony. It was thus with the Puritans, with the Quakers, with Lord Baltimore and his Catholic companions and with the Huguenots farther south. Perhaps sufficient attention has not been drawn to the early history of Virginia in this matter.

It seems quite evident that the people who founded Virginia and starved in their new settlement for nearly a generation did not think of themselves as going for the greater glory of God. But it is equally certain that most of their friends at home, who planned their expedition and supplied the money for it, meant first and last to check the power of Spain. They hated Spain as they hated the devil. Indeed, they did not separate the two in their thought. And when these men found that their colony was failing because their colonists only cared for the things which perish, the nobler part of them highly resolved that they would try the great adventure for themselves. They would seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and let the things follow as He might order. So that high-minded gentleman, Lord Delaware, surrounded by a body of the young Christian gentle-

men of England, embarked for the second time for Virginia, which he had left in 1611.

He understood, and the people with him understood, that they wanted to establish a bulwark against Spain. He sailed in the spring of 1618. Unfortunately he touched at the island of St. Michael, and unfortunately he and thirty-six of his companions fell sick at once and died there. Naturally, the impression was and is that their Spanish hosts poisoned them.

Perhaps it is not necessary to say all this. Whoever knows anything of the history of the century knows that considerations distinctly religious are at the centre of English history for the whole of that century. It was impossible that they should not appear in the history of the English colonists. When, after a century and a half, you come to the history of the great emigration that crossed the Alleghanies, you find similar experiences. Manassah Cutler, who led the New England colony out to Marietta in 1787, would not take a man and woman whose names he had on his roll until the Continental Congress passed the northwest ordinance prohibiting slavery forever. The old Confederacy is much abused in history and the Continental Congress, but it is a good deal for a set of so-called fainéants that they passed an ordinance, at once political and religious, which has proved in its results the Magna Charta of untold centuries. If you give Cutler the credit which belongs to him, this may be called a distinct work of religion. A New England clergyman means to abolish slavery as far as his power goes, and he does so. On the other hand, Daniel Boone and such men cross the Alleghanies and go West and acknowledge that they do so because the fields are fertile and the climate that of heaven. They do not distinctly announce what people call religious motives. They are not missionaries of any hierarchy. All the same, such men as Brainerd and the other American apostles follow, and one does not observe that the religious institutions south of the Ohio differ materially from those of the States in the Northwest territory. Sectarian writers seem to think that the Methodist preachers had for a time a superiority in numbers, and perhaps in general esteem in the States where they were eagerly welcomed and recognized. But in the statistics of the great Methodist church there would hardly be observed any difference to-day between the northern part of the Mississippi Valley and the southern. It has seemed to me worth while to say this because in speaking of the religious life of the American people one undoubtedly observes the two threads. In the advance of the country there has been distinctly an enthusiasm for the physical prosperity running side by side with the spiritual enthusiasm which wishes to advance the kingdom of God. Whether the distinctly ecclesiastical movement has achieved more in

the hundred and fifty years than the distinctly secular movement, it is really impossible to say. The men of this world, if you please to call them so, and the ecclesiastics, who suppose that they are religious orders, take occasion too often to claim each for his own side the preëminence. On each side enthusiastic disputants are apt to overstate their own successes where they are blind to the successes of their rivals.

The truth is that church and state are not parted in America as sophomores speaking at college exhibitions think they are. The organizations called by those names are parted, but the same sovereign appears, whether in the affairs of the church or in the affairs of the state. The same man votes in a presidential election on Tuesday who attends the vestry meeting or some other ecclesiastical duty on the day before or the day after.

When in a centennial celebration of the birth of the United States Constitution, a prelate high in rank took occasion to say to the President of the United States that our politics are far more corrupt than those of the century before, that the motives of public men are lower and their interests more mean, the President might have replied that in that hundred years the church as an organization had received everything that it had asked for, that its colleges had been established, its functions encouraged, its ministers respected. The President of the United States might have risen in his seat to say, "Is there anything in which the claims or the wishes of the church have been set on one side? And if this is so, will you be good enough to explain to us here why the political morals of the community have declined?"

In matter of fact, the exuberant health and prosperity of the country have chosen to assert themselves in every enterprise of spiritual, or divine, or moral endeavor. The prisons of the States have been conducted on the principles suggested by the ecclesiastics. The colleges have been endowed and carried on very largely under ecclesiastical auspices. This has frequently come out in absolute absurdity, for there are now colleges in the United States where a man may not teach the difference between the Optative and the Subjunctive moods in the Greek language if he is not sound as to the inspiration of the book of Jonah or as to the government of the church in New Padua. In the States where there is the least pretense of ecclesiastical, or what was called religious influence, in the foundation of society, there are still deep-cut traces of the glacial marks which show how large an influence directly religious had prevailed in their constitution of government and in their daily custom.

Dr. Andresen, a recent German writer, in his interesting treatise on the world's religion, says squarely:

"It has been prophesied that it is the United States whence will come

the religion of the future. And, notwithstanding the fact that there is a tendency to outspoken materialism, it cannot be denied that Americans as a rule highly value religion. This is proven by the striving for religious truth manifesting itself in various ways. Hardly in any country of the world are there so many religious sects as in the United States."

Yet he appears to believe that the supremacy of the nation which gives every man a right to say what he thinks and to think for himself will assert itself as distinctly in religion as it does in the manufacture of iron or of the supply of gold. This is probably so. Whether you are on the stump a month before the presidential election or whether you are at a missionary convention to celebrate the centennial of the missionary society, it might be observed all along that the country is profoundly religious. It believes in right, and it wants to have right done. The Puritans did not cross the ocean for nothing, nor the Huguenots. Such men as Asbury and Brainerd did not preach for nothing. Such lessons as the Revolution taught, of great made from small, by the mere power of faith, were not neglected. And that eternal experience, by which people who live much in the open air, in hourly presence of Nature, become thoughtful and religious people, has made a religious race from the pioneers and settlers of the frontier. The leader of Americans, who may wish to lead them forward in the line of that destiny which has triumphed thus far, leads a religious race in the methods of personal and spontaneous worship, with constant reference to the Eternal Laws. He does not appeal to this man's selfishness or to the greed of that community. He does not teach the wretched doctrine of a bald economy, to induce them to pile up gold or iron or brass. He appeals to the highest motives men can grasp, and cites the noblest law he knows. This law is a law outside themselves; it is the infinite law. It is the Power who makes for Righteousness.

It is to be observed at the same time that this profound religious sentiment is for nineteen-twentieths of the people who are governed by it entirely dissociated from the Alphas and Omegas of the ecclesiastics. The ecclesiastics do not believe this; they do not know it. On their side nineteen-twentieths of them have been educated to suppose that the word "religious" means synods, councils, conferences, and conventions and customs and traditions. Nineteen-twentieths of them worship jots and tittles and bells and pomegranates as heartily as did the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. But to the People, by and large, the men whom you meet in the railway car, or who fill the hall of the caucuses, all the little devices of the ecclesiastics are a matter of indifference—with most of the people they are unknown. Thus the Irish servant-girl is glad to have a Protestant ecclesiastic say "God

bless you " to her. A boy and girl drive into a country town to be married. They go to the church whose door they find open. A regiment in the army is told that a new chaplain is coming. The men neither know nor care whether he belongs to the Cumberland Presbyterian or the Old Line Presbyterian or the United Presbyterian. The Minister of the Second Secession thinks the man cares, but that is because the minister reads what is called his denominational newspaper.

Stated in few words, the American people have an immense respect for the announcements of the ecclesiastics, but hardly think of even reading them, far less of governing themselves by their directions. "They want me to be baptized," said a shivering black woman in Boston, only six months from freedom and the climate of Carolina, "but I can't be baptized because it's so cold." Quite unconsciously the good woman expressed the view which nineteen-twentieths of the people of America really have regarding ecclesiastical symbols.

Thirty years ago at a meeting of very distinguished political leaders who were preparing for a canvass, one of them said to another, "We must shut up the mouths of the ministers." To which the other replied, "Why, I do not see that. I should never go to church if I thought the minister's mouth was shut up. I want to know what he thinks." "Oh, no," said Number One, "they make us pretend to believe a lot of things no man in his senses believes, and when it comes round to election they must hold their tongues till the election is over." This was in the State of New York.

This represented quite well the current habit, one can hardly say, opinion, among most classes of people, the ecclesiastics on the one hand, and the leaders of the people on the other. But with the passage of a generation a simpler system has evolved itself,—this system in which the people, by and large, are entirely indifferent to the formal creeds of the churches. Even in the conventions of ecclesiastics you are told, for instance, that the thirty-nine articles are a plan of the bookbinder or you are told that people receive creeds for substance of doctrine and not for any finesse of expression. You are told, as Maurice told Stanley, that you must preserve the traditions of the Middle Ages as "matters of history." Thus when you state, "I believe in the Athanasian Creed," you mean, "I believe that the Athanasian Creed was a part of the creed of the Church a thousand years ago." Four men out of five whom you should meet in travelling, if you were blocked in a snowstorm for thirty-six hours and had to converse with each other without intercourse with the outward world, would commit themselves to some such statement of their religion as this: "I think a man ought to do about right. I think he can find out what is right in the Bible.

I guess if he does that he will find the world after he dies will be a good enough place for him to live in."

That is to say, the American people believe profoundly in a life larger than the life of things. Men have a profound certainty, which nothing shakes, that there is a God who somehow knows what is good for them better than they know for themselves. The immense majority of people is glad to be reminded and assured of this ideal life and of Him who directs it to-day.

There are enough left of persons attached to special documentary statements and still more to special formal rituals, to keep for a time in existence the great ecclesiastical organizations. But with every year it becomes more and more certain that by the year 2000 no ecclesiastical organization now existing in America will retain its present form. This statement was made as early as the year 1870, by the distinguished President of Brown University. Thirty years have more than justified a position which then seemed somewhat startling.

THE SCLAVS

PETER ROBERTS

WHEN a Slovak priest was asked: "What is the meaning of the word Slav?" he instantly replied, "Glory," and added, "In all churches wherein the Sclavs worship, Slava Bogu (glory to God) is chanted, and Slava is the same word as Slav." This is the interpretation commonly accepted by the majority of the race. Scholars support this view by affirming that the root from which the word is derived signifies "intelligence" and that Slav means "the intelligible people." Others, however, derive the word from a root signifying "to call," and affirm that Slav means the "called ones"—those who are commanded; that is, serfs and slaves. The former interpretation represents the pride and expectation of the Sclavophiles, who believe that their race is providentially destined to lead the world in civilization, by preserving and perpetuating the Christian faith, by establishing law and order, by enforcing obedience to authority, and by realizing the full fruition of forces of progress which are now arrested by the senility of European nations who stand at an open grave wherein the glory of extinct kingdoms is buried. The latter interpretation represents the sentiments of the Sclavophobs, who believe that no good has ever come or ever will come from the Slav, because its sons are the arch-corruptionists of the Christian faith; the uncompromising foes of democratic institutions; the destroyers of the inalienable rights to freedom of thought and of conscience; and the greatest hindrance to the onward progress of that civilization which has done so much for the peoples of Europe. Both positions are those of extremists, and each is wide of the mark chalked out by the judgment of history. This article is a study of the Slav's (I) Historical Development, (II) Racial Characteristics, (III) Recent Progress.

I.

The Slav, in the family of nations, belongs to the Indo-European stem, which comprises the Asiatic and European Aryans. The European branch separated to north and south; the former, comprised the Germanic and the Letto-Slavic peoples; the latter, the Greeks, Italians, and Kelts. The Letto-Sclavs were separated into Letts and Sclavonians. The Sclavonians are divided into East, West and South Sclavs. The East branch comprises the Great Russians, the White Russians and the Little Russians; the West branch, the Sclavs who live on the Elbe, the Wends of Lusatia, the Poles who dwell in the extinct kingdom of Poland and in Galicia, the

Czecks in Bohemia and Meringia, and the Slovaks in the northern principality of Hungary; the South branch comprises the Slavs inhabiting the southeast portion of the Alps in Austria, the Bulgarians of the Danube, and the inhabitants of Croatia, Servia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Moldavia and Slavonia. All these peoples do not speak the Slavic language. Those on the Elbe have been Germanized, those of Moldavia and Slavonia have been Romanized, and many in the Turkish empire are zealous Mussulmans. The Bulgarians—a people of Ugrian origin—have alienated their tongue more than any other branch of this great race, while the Polish language contains many foreign elements. Nevertheless, the vast majority of Slavs speak the ancient Slavic language, or dialects of the same, and an educated Ruthenian said that he had little difficulty in conversing with representatives of the 100,000,000 Slavic peoples. At the head of these millions stand the Great Russians, whose language in magnificent prospect rivals that of any race and whose dignity and strength admirably “fit it to be the tongue of an imperial people.”

No date can be fixed for the coming of the Slav to Europe. In the table of nations given by Herodotus (450 B.C.), a tribe, the Budini, is described as having blue eyes and blonde hair. These people, with considerable probability, have been pointed out as the ancestors of the Slavs. Pytheas (200 B.C.), the Massilian, spoke of the Germanic tribes but not of the Slavs. Tacitus (100 A.D.) and Ptolemy (150 A.D.) spoke of the Wends—a name given the Slavs by the Germans. The first time the word appeared in history was in the work of the Gothic historian, Jordanes, (600 B.C.) who mentioned the “*Slavini et Antes*” among the unsettled peoples of Eastern Europe. The Teutons preceded the Slavs on the Continent; the former first settled on the shores of the Pontus, and, moving westward over the highlands of Central Europe, settled between the Vistula and the Elbe; the latter, moving in the same direction from the shores of the Caspian Sea, settled between the Dwina and the Vistula. The Teutons, following the rivers emptying into the Atlantic Ocean, became the heirs of the civilization of the Mediterranean races and found their sphere of influence in hospitable regions; the Slavs, following those emptying into the Arctic Ocean, settled among peoples living in the hunting and fishing stages of civilization, and found their sphere of influence limited to inhospitable regions. These facts, in part, explain the Slav’s slow progress in civilization as compared with the Kelts and Teutons.

The plains of Russia, from time immemorable, have been the scene of Mongolian and Tatar invasions. Over these the nomad Slavs wandered, but little is known of their movements during the first three centuries of

the Christian era. At the close of the third century, Slavs were found in the Balkan peninsula, where probably they were transported as prisoners of war. Two centuries later, they drove out the dwellers in the plains east of the Carpathian mountains and, in the following century, Heraclius, the Byzantine Emperor, employed them as a bulwark against the incursions of the Avars. Slav nomads, at this early date, proved themselves brave warriors. When a company of them was brought into the camp of the Khazars, a sage prophesied: "These men's swords have two edges; ours have but one. We conquer now, but some day they will conquer us." The prophecy was fulfilled in the tenth century. In the seventh century the Serbs left their home on the Carpathian mountains and joined their brethren in the Balkan peninsula. The Bulgarians, settling about the middle of the seventh century in Moesia, conquered the Slavs of the Balkans and, for three centuries, held their own against the Huns, the Turks and Byzantium. The Slavs of the south must have played a leading part in these conflicts, for by the ninth century they had so Slavonized their conquerors that the old Finnish tongue was abandoned and the Slavic language adopted in divine worship. In the eighth century, two streams of Slavic colonizers moved eastward to the western plains of Russia. The northern left the territory watered by the Elbe and Vistula, the southern that of the Danube. These, living in democratic communities, will soon consolidate and enter into the arena where the nations of two continents wrestle for the mastery.

Thus, for five hundred years, when Finns and Norsemen, Huns and Avars, Mongolians and Tatars, shifted the nations of Europe as the simoon the sands of the desert, the Slav maintained his individuality, preserved his type and kept his language essentially intact. His wanderings brought him to the Elbe on the north and to Austria and Greece on the south. As the tenth century dawned, he stood in the vigor of youth on the plains where kingdoms rise and wane: "The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him and persecuted him, but his bow abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong."

Each of the Slav groups now consolidated. The Serbs formed a kingdom in old Illyricum and a part of Moesia; the Poles on the highland where the Vistula and Oder rise; and the Russians in the vicinity of Lake Illmen. Rurik, the Norseman, led the Russians and, conquering the neighboring Slav tribes, firmly established a dynasty of kings who ruled for six centuries. His son and grandson extended their kingdom southward and engaged the armies of Byzantium, and for the first time a Muscovite king coveted the Golden Horn. Igor did not succeed (941 A.D.) in capturing Constantinople, but in the following year a treaty of peace was made and

signed by fifty of his chiefs, among whom three were Slavs. To the south-west of the kingdom of Russia, a rival rose under the leadership of princes of native blood. Located on an undulating plain, having no natural bulwarks against the onslaught of powerful rivals, the rise of the Polish kingdom was more precarious than that of its kinsmen to the north. On the west were the Germans; on the north the Scandinavians; on the east, the most dangerous foe of all, the Russians. With these foes Poland struggled for eight hundred years, and at last was ruined by the selfishness of its aristocracy, the intrigue of its ecclesiastics, and the serfdom of its peasantry. The Serbs in Illyricum and Moesia established a kingdom which lasted four centuries. The leadership was taken by one of the Zupans into which the territory was divided and, notwithstanding the close proximity of Byzantium, its power in the twelfth century enabled it to compete successfully with the Greek emperors. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Serbs maintained their independency against the attacks of Mongols, Huns and Greeks. The unhappy people, however, were destined to lose their independence. After a brief taste of civilization, they were sent back to the yoke of their ignorant and unsympathetic Ottoman masters by the complete defeat sustained at the hand of the Turks in "the field of blackbirds" (1389). For four hundred years did the iron yoke of the Mussulmans rest heavily upon the Serbs, and Servia lost the best of her sons who migrated to escape the tyranny of the Turk. In 1804, this branch of the Slav race rose in rebellion and was finally saved from complete defeat by the intervention of Russia.

During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the kingdoms of Poland and Russia paid tribute to the Mongol, and, although they escaped the fate of their brethren of the south, their suffering was second only to that of Servia. Tatars swept over their plains, burnt their towns and villages, and forced their princes to bow the knee to the Great Khan. When the struggle went on, the so-called Christian nations of Europe looked on complacently and, while the Slav was buffeted, took no interest in the war except in so far as their own safety was threatened. After two centuries of bondage, the Slavs of the east and west threw off the Mongol's yoke, but for another two centuries this people formed the bulwark of Europe against Tatar invasions, until at last the pious John Sobieski and his Poles, in 1683, came to the relief of Austria, and drove the Mongols from the continent. He, as Charles Martel before him, saved Christendom from the Mohammedans, and was greeted from the altar of the cathedral of Vienna, wherein kings and princes returned thanks for the victory, with the text: "there was a man sent from God whose name was John." The Poles

made themselves a vicarious sacrifice and were rewarded by Christian Europe with wounds which finally proved fatal. The craftiness of the house of Hapsburg, the jealousy of their Teutonic neighbors, the invasion of the Scandinavians, the rivalry of Russia, were more than Poland could resist. Weakened by foes from without and torn by internal dissension, Poland became the land of war, of tumult and of plunder. Its streets were bathed in blood, its fields were burned by its own sons, and the tramp of foreign armies sealed the doom of the second kingdom of the Sclavic peoples. Its fate was determined in 1772. Russia took the lion's share, subdued the arrogance of its nobles, established peace and order in the land, and made possible the economic advancement of the brilliant branch of the Sclavic race.

The fall of Poland left Russia the sole representative of the Slav among the kingdoms of the earth. The Muscovites waxed strong and built their kingdom upon the wrecks of democratic communities. The nomads of the south gave them considerable trouble. One of their chroniclers says: "They burn the villages, the farmyards and the churches. The land is turned by them into a desert and the overgrown fields become the lair of wild beasts. Many people are led away into slavery; others are tortured and killed, or die from hunger and thirst." Another says: "In the Russian land is rarely heard the voice of the husbandman, but often the cry of the vultures fighting with each other over the bodies of the slain, and the ravens scream as they fly to the spoil." The Khan of the Crimea, the Cossacks of the Don, the Turks of the Ottoman Empire, made periodical incursions for booty and for slaves, and, for centuries, the Slav's sword saved Europe from barbaric hordes. Russia is called the "nation of the sword," and well it was for the continent that its sons could wield it so mightily, for no other means was effectual to check the advance of Tatars, whose torch and scimitar wrought untold havoc. The blood-thirsty ruler, Mahmoud, with the instincts of the savage, revelled in shedding the blood of Christians, and nothing but the merciless Slav could bring the merciless Turk to reason.

But at home the Slav's hand was not less gentle. The boyars sometimes rose and slew their princes. Their conduct gave rise to the proverb, "If the prince is bad, into the mud with him." No Tatar ever witnessed more bloody conflicts than those waged by Ivan the Terrible in Novgorod, in 1570. The Sclavs used the iron hand, but the work they had to do and the material upon which they worked required the soldier more than the priest. Peter the Great, with his master mind, found it necessary to drown the arrogance, prejudices and superstitions of his nobles in blood. Not

till the middle of the eighteenth century was the Slav recognized among the powers of Europe when the light of western civilization began to stream through the window opened by the greatest of the Muscovite Tsars on the Baltic Sea. In the nineteenth century, the Slav stood forth as the champion of Christians who groaned under Mussulman's misrule. Christian Europe stood aloof when their co-religionists were mercilessly slain by Ottomans, but the Slav compelled the Sultan to honor the conscience of their brethren, and, releasing Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia and Bulgaria from the Turkish yoke, caused a new era to dawn for them. Russia's work in Turkey is one of the brightest pages of nineteenth-century history. The Slav, regenerated by the leaven of new ideals, has earned the distinction, on more than one occasion, of being the restorer of law and order among the kingdoms of Europe. The Crimean War rudely awoke him from his self-confidence, pride, and ignorance, and, as the smoke of conflict cleared, he saw a brighter day dawning, which the emancipation of the serfs, in 1861, proclaimed to all the earth. Russia, after a thousand years of warfare and strife, is to-day a worthy leader in the Pan-Slavic movement, whose ideal is the hegemony in the industrial, commercial, and religious affairs of the world.

II.

Is the Slav capable of this?

The average Slav, anthropologically considered, is as good an animal as the average member of any European people. The dolichocephalic Saxon looks with prejudice upon the brachycephalic Slav, but all cranial forms possess only an artificial value and tell us nothing respecting the several grades of mental power contained within. If we take cranial capacity, which most distinguishes man from the apes, and study the measurements obtained from the researches of A. Weisbach and Hermann Welcker, we find that they are not unfavorable to the Slavs. The average weight of the brain of Germans is 1314.5 grains; that of Magyars 1322.8; that of Slavs 1325.2. If it is claimed that the capacity of the skull is of more importance in ethnology than the weight of the brain, the Slavs need not be ashamed of this test. The average capacity of the skull of Kelts is 1459 cubic centimetres, that of Magyars 1422, that of Germans 1470, and that of Slavs 1478. Again, if we take the discovery of Calori of Bologna, we must believe that the brachycephali have heavier brains than the dolichocephali, which is decidedly in favor of the Slavs, whose index of breadth varies from 81.6 to 85.1, that of Germans from 76.7 to 80.1, that of Kelts from 73.4 to 79.5. Thus if the capacity of the cranium, the weight of the brain, or the form of the skull, has anything to do with the future domi-

nancy of the world, the Slav's chance is as good as that of any race on the continent of Europe.

No scientist has discovered in the Slav pithecoïd features which assign him a lower place than that occupied by the peoples of Europe in the supposed hierarchy of the races of mankind. Virchow has shown that prognathism is inconsistent with the full development of the brain, and that the prognathous type of face is almost exclusively confined to nations in which civilization appears somewhat immature. But this unpropitious position of the jaw is not more prevalent among the Slavs than among other European races. It is not so common in Moscow as in Paris, and cases of prognathism can be seen as frequently in England and Germany as in Russia. Craniologists have also shown that prognathism prevails as a rule in narrow skulls, while medium and broad skulls are mostly mesognathous or occasionally opisthognathous, which fact again favors the Slav. The shortness of the upper limbs separates man from the animals which most resemble him. Carl Vogt has expressed this relation by saying that the orang can, in an erect position, touch its ankles; the gorilla, the middle of the tibia; the chimpanzee, the knee; whereas man can scarcely reach the middle of the thigh. Weisbach's measurements show that the average length of the arms of Germans is 0.469 of the length of the body, and that of Slavs 0.467. If, finally, the bodily height and weight of the average Slav are compared with those of the average member of European races, the result is as favorable to the former as to the latter. Snigriew, after a careful comparison of the measurements of German, Lithuanian, Polish, and Russian recruits, concluded that there was no practical difference between the several peoples. Thus, anthropologically or ethnologically considered, the Slav is not a whit behind those nations who claim a right to lead in the civilization of the world, because of greater fitness to discharge the duties and obligations involved in the task.

If we compare the social and industrial life of the Slav with that of the Teuton, he must be assigned a lower place in the history of civilization. Industrially considered, the great mass of the Slav race is an elemental people, making, with their own hands, in their own homes, what they wear and use. Under the stern rule of many of the Tsars, men who dreamed of making their brethren happy, virtuous and refined were sent to exile and the scaffold. The social awakening that followed the revolution of 1848-1849 was energetically arrested by Nicholas, who substituted "the French quadrille in the place of Adam Smith." The majority of Slav agriculturists are still in the primitive stage. The margin between the real want and the felt want of the Slav is small. The masses wear comparatively

little underclothing; the favorable materials employed in native cookery are sour cabbage, cucumbers and kvass. Eternal stillness is the character of Slav provincial life. The system of public instruction in Russia is inadequate. The paternalism of the Government has been fatal to individual initiative; autocracy has strangled all attempts at constitutional government; and religious authority, while suppressing freedom of conscience has tolerated gross superstition and buried the essential principles of morality under a weight of sensuous forms and mysterious rites. The Slav in our courts considers the most barefaced and patent falsehood as a fair means of self-defense, and many of them have very lax ideas as to the rights of persons and property. These specks and blemishes are visible, but the student will patiently study the phenomena and seek the deep-rooted causes by which these specks and blemishes are produced rather than make sweeping generalizations. Catherine said of Riviere, the French physiocrat: "He supposed we walked on all fours, and very politely he took the trouble to come from La Martinique to teach us how to stand on the hind legs." Teutons and Kelts have manifested the same proud contempt for the Slav in modern times, giving little thought to the fact that he is the child of a different civilization from our own.

The Slav has lived under the iron hand of autocracy. Outside the Mir he has no voice in the government. It is second nature in him to obey. When Teutonic kings had to struggle with municipal institutions to prevent them from becoming too powerful, the Tsars had to struggle to prevent them from committing suicide or dying of inanition. The Slav, accustomed to lean on the arm of autocracy, has not advanced on the road of progress in a smooth, gradual and prosaic way as Teutons do, but rather by a series of unconnected and frantic efforts as the whim possessed the autocrat. Slavs regard the State as an entity wholly distinct from themselves and having interests entirely different from their own, and the State never hesitated to ruthlessly sacrifice the interests of the individual when its own were involved. Under a state policy that knows no change generation after generation, the boundaries of the empire have been extended, so that to-day the Tsar's sons are seen on the shores of the Arctic and Pacific oceans, on the frontier of China and in Central Asia, the embodiment of patient endurance, of dogged resistance, and stoical fortitude. Fed on sour cabbage, soup, black bread, dried fish and weak tea, the Slav soldier is patient, good-natured, and never complains. On sea or land he is obedient, tenacious of purpose, self-confident and contented; is never anxious for the morrow, for his plans embrace generations yet unborn. The results are that in Turkestan and in Central Asia, the Slav has wrought wonders.

He has established law and order where anarchy once prevailed; the wilderness has blossomed under his rule; avenues of commerce have been opened and the nations of the earth enriched; the barbarian is on the highway to industrial efficiency, for the robber chief is suppressed and the tillers of the soil find their person and property safe. In Siberia, the Slav is at his best. This former land of convicts, by the industry and thrift of the colonizers, is become one of the greatest wheat granaries of the world. On the slopes of the Pacific, the robber bands who defied Mongolian rulers have been annihilated, and Chinese and Slav farmers feel perfectly secure under the protection of the Muscovite. Peking has been brought within two weeks' journey of Moscow, and the Russian steamers between Odessa and Port Arthur afford facilities for traveling and commerce second to none in the world. At home the same strong hand guides the destiny of the empire. By the dictum of the Tsar 40,000,000 serfs were liberated. It was the greatest reform of the nineteenth century and effected without a revolution. The nobility were deprived of their land, the serfs given freehold claims, and the conditions of the transaction laid down by the autocrat of St. Petersburg. A ukase establishes the gold standard, erects a tariff wall around the empire, fosters infant industries, takes under its protection the vodka shops of the empire, curbs the selfishness of employers and the arrogance of employees, and makes industrial war a crime. A ukase prohibits the black clergy from deviating from the rules of St. Basil, refuses permission to a Russian once within the pale of the Orthodox church to depart thence, commands the white clergy to refrain from innovation, secures the laity uniformity and continuity in divine worship, plants churches wherever its children go as colonizers, and secures its Mohammedan, Roman Catholic and Protestant subjects immunity from persecution. Paternalism is the very breath of life of the Russian Government, and if the Slav has lost individual initiative he has gained in obedience to authority; if he has lost constitutional government, he has gained immunity against the arrogance of nobles and the greed of entrepreneurs; if he has lost freedom of opinion and freedom of conscience, he has gained exemption from the tyranny of majorities, the vicissitudes of public elections, and the multiplicity of sects. Autocracy and democracy have their weak and strong points. It is not our task to decide which is the better for a nation. The Slav is the child of autocratic power and none dare say that his efficiency among the nations of the world is compromised thereby. On the shores of the Pacific, on the tablelands of Tibet, on the plateaus of Mongolia, on the broad plains of Siberia, the Slav is the presiding genius. When he speaks in Peking, or Cabool, or Teheran, or Constantinople, the nations of Europe are silent and

emperors take council. When the Russian Bear shakes its prison bars on the shores of the Pontus the nations of the continent tremble. The most conservative of European statesmen have awakened to the fact that the future of Eastern Europe and Asia lies with the Slav race, and that it must be reckoned with. Nicholas once said: "Where the Russian flag is planted once, there it shall remain forever." The Tsar's boast was not exactly true to history, for the Slav has ceded conquered territory on five occasions in five centuries. Nevertheless, the firm grip of the Slav is well known, and no nation can boast of greater tenacity, higher aspirations, larger plans and more brilliant achievements than the Slavs of Russia.

But the Slav peasant;

"A thing that groans not and that never hopes,
Stolid and stunned, a brother to the ox?"

what of him? Mr. N. T. Bacon has said (*Yale Review*, May, 1904, p. 53): "From our standpoint the Russian peasant is idle and good-for-nothing." A. J. Beveridge thinks differently ("Russian Advance," p. 319): "He it is who tills the soil and fills the factories; he who consumes the tea, drinks the vodka, pays the taxes; he who equips the army and fights the empire's battles; he who mans the ships of Russia's growing fleets; he on whom the whole government rests; he who holds in his breast the destiny of the Slav race." Consider the following picture by the same author (p. 304): "They (the peasants) were working at their 'kustar trades' in that short period between the cultivation of their fields and the harvest of the grain which was not yet ripe. Thus their time and labor were turned into productive industry. In tens of thousands of the little country villages . . . workmen employ every moment of their time during the long winter months in some kind of manufacture. Not only the men, but the women and children, work at these trades." A people who in 1902 supported themselves and exported \$420,000,000 worth of goods composed of 62 per cent. of grain and provisions, and 32 per cent. of raw and undressed materials, and only two per cent. of cotton goods; a people who, working at their "kustar trades" between sowing and harvest or during winter, supply about nine-tenths of the goods for domestic consumption; a people who paid in taxation for the maintenance of the imperial government \$900,000,000 and manned the army and navy which guard the frontiers or protect the coast, ought to be counted good for something, no matter from what standpoint they are studied.

We have in the United States about a million and a quarter Slav immigrants who represent the peasant class. Whoever has studied them in the

mines and on the farms, in the mills and on the wharfs, in the forests and on the rivers, must bear testimony to their daring courage, constant industry, prompt obedience and patient endurance. Men believed, a generation ago, that the mining industry of Pennsylvania could not be carried on if the English and Welsh, Irish and Scotch, Germans and Americans were withdrawn. To-day, in eight shafts in the Mahanoy Valley, employing about 2500 contract miners, less than 5 per cent. of them are Kelts and Teutons. The Poles, Ruthenians and Slovaks get out the coal and the per capita production is to-day greater than it was twenty-five years ago, notwithstanding the fact that the operation requires three times the muscular effort which it then required. In 1903, over five hundred of these men sacrificed their lives in the collieries of Pennsylvania, and another army of 1500 was injured in this risky business. The Slav will work where "white men" will not; he is willing to work ten, twelve and fourteen hours a day if he can earn high wages. They are patient and persevering. Many are stupid and slow, but many are also apt and efficient. All are amenable to discipline, submissive to authority and silent under difficulties. The Slav is easily led, believes absolutely in and idolizes his leader, is easily excited and when aroused soon forgets the teachings of civilization and falls to the unstable nature of his barbaric ancestors. Many are unclean; all drink; their quarrels and fights are fiendish in their atrocities; their standard of living is low; their social customs repugnant and some of their religious practices are tainted with superstition. But in all this we speak as Americans, we judge as Americans, and our standard is the highest ever attained in the history of civilization. Compare the social and moral conditions of Slav mining communities with those of Great Britain as depicted in the Parliamentary report of 1866, or compare their life to-day with that found in anthracite communities in 1876 by Abram S. Hewitt: "In 1876 . . . I made a tour of inspection through the mining regions. I found terrible conditions then. I found the men living like pigs and dogs, under wretchedly brutal conditions." These were immigrants of the British Isles and few Slav settlements to-day deserve so dark a setting.

The Muzhik has many undesirable qualities. But let us remember that yesterday he was a serf who could be sold as the ox and the horse. If he ran away or dared to present a petition against his master, he was beaten with the knout or sent to the mines in Siberia. His proprietor could impose on him every kind of labor, could take from him money dues, could demand from him personal service, and could send the promising youth to the army. Is it strange, then, that these men bear in their body and mind the marks of twenty centuries of serfdom? And yet this peasant—the heir

of five centuries of vassalage—is good-natured and pacific, is adaptable and imperturbable, has an instinct for organization, is an apt pupil under competent masters, is admirably fitted for the work of peaceful agricultural colonization, is long-suffering and conciliatory and capable of bearing extreme hardships. When he is taken out of the environment where the blight of serfdom is still felt and comes in contact with foreign nations, he immediately adopts foreign ideas and foreign inventions. When freed from the trammels of hereditary conceptions, when liberated from the bondage of clannish suspicion, when once he treads the path of industrial and commercial speculation, his “go-ahead” is truly American. Practical common-sense sways the vast majority of this people. Sentimental considerations and loud-sounding phrases have very little if any place in their life. What they want is a house to live in, food to eat, raiment wherewith to be clothed. Neo-Malthusianism is not in the Slav’s creed; both men and women believe that children are “an heritage of the Lord” and are “as arrows in the hand of a mighty man.” Bachelors and spinsters are not found among them. In no country in Europe is the birth-rate so high as among Slavs and medical science, in recent years, has beneficently checked infant mortality among the peasants. With the increase of material well-being, of intellectual and moral culture, refined sensitiveness and keen sympathy with physical suffering are becoming characteristics of Slavs. Slav peasantry is fallow ground for the seed of a higher civilization, and none better appreciates the light. This young giant, who “hath as it were the strength of the wild ox” and who “as a lion doth lift himself up,” turns his face, radiant with hope, to the rising sun. He is conscious of a mission to perform; he shakes himself from the dust; he looses himself from the bands of his neck, “he shall not lie down until he eat of the prey and drink the blood of the slain.”

III.

Signs of the Slav’s progress are not wanting. Ethno-sentimental considerations are moving Slav nobles, who have in recent times exhibited a sensitiveness to humanitarian conceptions second to none on the continent. They look upon the peasant as a brother and have few of the frailties of aristocrats. The horrible cruelty of a Saltykof is no longer possible. The court of St. Petersburg is as moral as that of any nation, and the Muscovite is honored among the nations as a ruler who establishes justice and maintains authority. No longer are court favorites honored, as Menshikof was, by a present of thousands of peasants. A noble’s fortune is no longer computed by the number of his serfs. Priests and nobles no longer receive cruel corporal punishment with whips because of delinquencies. In 1771,

Archbishop Ambrose was massacred in Moscow for attempting to enforce sanitary measures during a plague; in St. Petersburg, about the middle of the last century, a mob pelted the metropolitan with missiles and threw the doctors out of the windows of the hospital because they suspected them of poisoning the wells; to-day, the people in both cities are peaceful; sanitary measures are instituted according to modern scientific principles; the hospitals have on their staffs some of the leading scientists of the world; and the masses gather in people's palaces, where weak tea and free entertainments are furnished. A century ago the papers of Moscow advertised serfs for sale, and a Russian who evinced any desire for travel was regarded with suspicion; to-day, the Moscow press advertises free land for peasants and Russians travel as extensively as any people. Fifty years ago only two per cent. of the peasants who joined the army could read; now 33 per cent. of them can do so. Forty years ago, two-thirds of the people of Russia had no rights which they could enforce against their superiors, and justice, when administered, proclaimed its decrees from behind closed doors. Now, the proceedings of the tribunals are public, criminal cases are tried by jury, petty cases are tried by Justices of the Peace, and the course of justice is simplified to meet the demands of the people. Frederick the Great said of the Russian soldiers, "We have to do with barbarians, who are digging the grave of humanity." A century later, General Skobelev, in the war of Bulgaria, had to command a halt and furnish carts and men to care for the babes who were thrown away by their Turkish mothers and picked up by the Russian soldiers as they pursued the foe. These are landmarks of progress.

The Slav soldier is still capable of wielding the sword with the ferocity of a Jephthah or a Gideon, but it is on the principle that it is better to cut off the hand and the foot than have the whole body cast into hell. When Skobelev sheathed his sword in Central Asia, peace, order and safety were established, but previous to the advent of the Russian tumult, anarchy and terrorism prevailed. Under the wise guidance of patriotic statesmen the accursed vodka shops—the breeders of drunkenness and poverty—are regulated and the peasants are provided with tea houses where the social instinct of the Slav is met. In no European state are there more comprehensive laws relative to employers' liability than in Russia, while many of the states of the Union can well afford to learn of Slav statesmen how to regulate factories where children are sacrificed both day and night upon the altar of mammonism. The railroads of Manchuria and the Caucasus have broken down the barbarous custom of collecting transportation taxes which rendered commerce in the interior of Asia and China impossible. Under

the Slavs' supervision good roads are made and model towns are built where formerly barbarous communities dwelt in filth. Wherever the Slav builds he guards against disease, squalor and unsightliness which are common occurrences where Mongols and Tatars dwell. The Slav peasant is slowly awakening to a realization of his independence, to a due appreciation of economic freedom, to an understanding of the rights of property, and to the market value of industry, temperance and truthfulness. Slav statesmen proclaim the commercial value of honesty, the necessity of enterprise in manufacturing industries and commerce, the worth of new methods in production, and the markets which await the production of farms and factories. All the lessons which industrial liberty teaches, all the blessings which science and art bring, all the results which centuries of civilization realize, are brought to the feet of this youth in whose heart are stored the energies of centuries of stolid living. Give him time, and the pressure of new wants and new ideas will awaken his sleepy brain and set in motion his sluggish nerves and effect a metamorphosis which the combined wisdom of philosophers and theorists cannot effect. Lobenoff changed the face of Europe in an incredibly short time; the foreign statesmanship of Russia in far-sightedness is not surpassed by that of any other modern nation; the Slav has developed a diplomacy which equals in skill and resource that of any other people of ancient or modern times; and when the Slav peasant fully awakes to the demands of modern life, he will go forth with singing and "come again with joy, bringing his sheaves with him." Let another Peter the Great arise to lead these 100,000,000 Slavs, strong in their youthful vigor, confident that they have a mission to fulfill, and what obstacles can stand before their onward march? If they arm themselves for battle their armies will shake two continents, and the Slavophobs' worst fears will be realized. If they seek a higher victory—"the victory of Science, Art and Faith"—the dream of the Slavophils in part may be realized, viz., that the Slav will restore the world, demoralized by atheism in religion and anarchy in government, to sanity, faith, and order.

THE RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR: ITS CAUSES AND ITS RESULTS

BARON KENTARO KANEKO, LL.D.

IN the early years of the nineteenth century England fought against Napoleonic militarism in defence of European civilization, and now, at the dawn of the twentieth century, it has become necessary for a little island empire off the coast of Asia to take up arms in defence of Anglo-American civilization in the Far East. Japan is fighting, certainly, first of all for her own existence, as England, in the last century, fought for hers. But just as truly as the great cause of civilization was at stake then, upon the battlefields of Europe, so now the future of this same civilization, in its Asiatic development, hangs upon the destiny of Japan in the present struggle.

Whether Japan's cause will or will not prevail, no one can tell at this stage of the conflict, but since every historic event has its antecedents and its results inseparably interwoven, it is not hard at least to infer what the outcome of the war will be in the event of Russia's triumph, or what it will be if the arms of Japan are finally victorious.

In order to enumerate these facts intelligibly enough for a legitimate inference as to results, we must make a rapid survey of the history of the Russian occupation of Manchuria, for it is the Manchurian question which has brought the two nations into their present conflict.

The Chino-Japanese war in 1894-5 resulted in China's ceding to us the Liao-Tung Peninsula, but no sooner had this cession been made than Russia, with the support of France and Germany, compelled us to give up our spoils of victory, on the ground that a surrender of Manchurian territory by China to Japan would constitute a menace to the peace of Asia, and therefore must not be permitted. In order to avert this supposed menace to the peace of Asia, Japan consented to restore the peninsula to China, never for a moment thinking that Russia would ultimately come into possession of it. But scarcely a year had passed when, in 1896, Russia made a secret agreement with China by which she obtained the right to construct a railway through the northern part of Manchuria, for the purpose of giving her a shorter access to the port of Vladivostok, and this railway was afterward extended through the southern part of the peninsula. Nor was this all. In the following year, 1897, she obtained permission from China to winter her fleet at Port Arthur, and in 1898 Port Arthur and also Dalny were formally leased to Russia; then followed the rapid fortifying of these places and other important strategic positions in the

province, and finally Russia arrogated to herself the right to ignore completely Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria, and also existing treaty rights of Japan and other powers in regard to that region of the Celestial Empire.

Now, such occupation of Manchuria by Russia was not only destructive of the principle of equity in respect to commercial opportunities, and an impairment of the territorial integrity of China, but it was also a flat contradiction of the principle of the maintenance of permanent peace in Asia, for which principle alone Japan had given up her spoils of victory.

Moreover, and this was of still greater moment to Japan, Russia, thus stationed on the flank of Korea, would be a constant menace to the separate existence of that empire, and in any event would exercise there a predominant influence. For years Russia has been seeking to encroach upon Korea. After having obtained, some years ago, the concession of an enormous forest belt in the upper range of the Yalu River, she obtained last year from the Korean government the right to use Yongampo, near the mouth of the river, as a lumber depot in which to receive her timber as it came down stream.

Japan soon had reason to suspect that she was converting the place into a fortification, an idea not dispelled when a member of the Japanese legation at Seoul, who had been sent to investigate this matter, was refused permission to land. Korea has long been regarded by us as an important outpost in our line of defence, and we consider the independence of that empire absolutely essential to our peace and safety. Having these important political as well as industrial interests there, we could not quietly look on at Russia's aggressions; and, indeed, we had no security that the rapacity of Russia would not go even farther and threaten the very independence of our own empire.

The situation of affairs in Manchuria was also a cause of great anxiety. The continued presence of a large Russian army in this province was in itself a violation of the agreement made by all the powers after the suppression of the Boxer outbreak in China. It had been agreed that all troops sent into the empire for the defence of the legations, and to aid in restoring order, should be withdrawn at the earliest possible moment, Russia alone being allowed a longer delay in consequence of her interests in Manchuria, which might be endangered by ill-subdued Boxers or general brigandage. A "railway police" was allowed her for a time, but the 8th of October, 1903, was fixed as the limit of her military occupation of the province.

As early as April of that year it became perfectly evident that instead of fulfilling this engagement to withdraw her troops, she was resolved to retain her position there, and strengthen it in every way, pouring troops

into Manchuria until she had occupied the whole province, and finally announcing her intention to hold it.

In view, therefore, of the situation in Manchuria and Korea, the Japanese government, on the 28th of July, opened negotiations with the Russian government "in a spirit of conciliation and frankness, with a view to the conclusion of an understanding to compose questions which are the cause of interest and natural anxiety."

On the 12th of August we submitted a draft for a basis of negotiations, stating clearly that we sought to settle matters relating to Korea and Manchuria. There was nothing in our draft that could not have been easily and promptly adjusted by friendly negotiation; but not until the 5th of October did Baron de Rosen, the Russian Minister at Tokio, present the counter proposal of Russia. After waiting so long, it was not only a surprise to us, but also a bitter disappointment, to find that the Russian draft made no reply to our remonstrances in respect to Manchuria, but dealt solely with Korea, demanding that Japan should not use any portion of Korean territory for military or strategic purposes, and should admit that Manchuria and its entire littoral were outside her sphere of interest.

The impossibility of our agreeing to such proposals hardly needs explanation. The Japanese government at once presented an amendment restoring the clause relating to Manchuria. Another delay ensued; repeated requests were made for an early answer, but without effect.

Throughout the whole course of negotiations Russia manifested a spirit of utter insincerity, positively refusing to meet the Japanese notes fairly and frankly. Always cunningly worded, the Russian notes failed to touch the point at issue, never making any proposal tangible enough to effect a settlement. Finally, on January 30th, 1904, our government pointed out the serious disadvantage to both powers of a further prolongation of the existing situation, and pressed for a definite reply. The only immediate response was that it was not possible to fix a date for sending an answer because it was necessary to wait upon the decision of the Emperor. An answer might come the next day, or in a year, or not at all.

But, meanwhile, what was Russia doing? She was hurrying her warships to the Asiatic station, sending troops and military supplies into Manchuria, and, without any disguise whatever, preparing for war. Before hostilities began she had about nineteen powerful warships in the East, aggregating in their tonnage 82,415 tons, and the work of putting together torpedo boat destroyers, which had been sent out in sections to Port Arthur, went on with the greatest possible rapidity. These were to be joined by

another powerful fleet of ten warships, if subsequent occurrences did not recall them. Long before the actual outbreak of the war the Russian troops stationed in the East numbered over 45,000, and Russian engineers had begun fortifying Liao-Nang, Hai-Cheng and other important strategic points. Further warlike preparations were made by massing troops along the northern frontier of Korea; and all this was done while Japan waited patiently for a favorable reply from Russia.

Finally, on February 1st, the military commandant at Vladivostok, under orders from St. Petersburg, requested the Japanese commercial agent at that port to notify his government that a state of siege might be proclaimed at any moment, and that he must make preparations to withdraw all Japanese residents to Habrovsk. At this time the Russian fleet at Port Arthur made a demonstration by leaving the port.

Being thus informed that all hope of peaceful result from our negotiations with Russia was gone, and seeing that there was no other course left for us to take, our government, on February 5th, sent the following telegram to the Russian government:

“In the presence of delays which remain largely unexplained, and naval and military activities which it is difficult to reconcile with entirely pacific aims, the Imperial Government have exercised in the depending negotiations a degree of forbearance which they believe affords abundant proof of their loyal desire to remove from their relations with the Imperial Russian Government every cause for future misunderstanding. But finding in their efforts no prospects of securing from the Imperial Russian Government an adhesion either to Japan’s moderate and unselfish proposals, or to any other proposals likely to establish a firm and enduring peace in the extreme East, the Imperial Government have no other alternative than to terminate the present futile negotiations. In adopting such course the Imperial Government reserve to themselves the right to take such independent action as they may deem best to consolidate and defend their menaced position, as well as to protect their established rights and legitimate interests.”

Such is, very briefly, the history of the Russian occupation of Manchuria, with the incidents that followed from it. Keeping these facts in mind, we are now prepared to infer what the outcome of the present war may be. From what has already been said, one thing at least is obvious, namely, that Japan has not entered upon this war from ambition in any form, either to extend her territory or to gain military fame. But her position had become critical in the extreme, and though she fully realized the giant might of her foe, she felt herself compelled by duty and honor to seek by this last resource the restoration of her rightful position in Man-

churia, as well as to protect her own independence already threatened by the Russian grip of Korea, her neighbor.

The outcome of such a war cannot be doubtful; if Japan is victorious, she will gain only that which she has sought through negotiations, no more, no less. There is not the slightest reason to apprehend her seeking to assume supremacy in the commerce and industry of the East, to the detriment of the already established rights and interests of Americans and Europeans. On the contrary, the western nations can hope to gain much through her success.

In proof of this assertion we again refer to facts. Prior to the time of the Chino-Japanese war of 1894-5, foreign powers, becoming aware of the enormous resources and immense possibilities of Central China, had vainly sought to gain for foreign trade a free access to that portion of the Celestial Empire. But neither European diplomacy nor pluck of American commercialism could avail to open that close-barred door. The Chinese are too obstinate to be persuaded, and not docile enough to be taught. But when Japan had China at her mercy, in 1895, one of her principal demands was that four ports, Sou-Chow, Han-Chow, Sho-Sei and Chang-King, should be thrown open for the trade of the world. In the interest of western powers Japan forced China to open these ports, with no discriminate favor for herself in any respect whatever, but rather she put herself on an equal footing with the others. If Japan's motive at this time had been her own self-interest, she might easily have made demands in some direction far more useful to herself, for, just finishing an expensive war with an enemy of such enormous resources, she was financially unable to compete with other powers on an equal footing. What she sought, however, was not exclusive privilege or peculiar advantage for herself, but fair dealing and equal opportunity for all.

The same generous policy was carried still further at that time. In concluding peace with China, Japan made another demand which western powers had long urged in vain. The industrial factories and operating mills now possessed by Americans and Europeans in China are the direct outcome of the Japanese demand in 1895. Scarcely ten years have passed since the treaty of Shimonoseki was signed, but the world to-day seems to have forgotten these facts, and "yellow peril" is the cry. The real peril to the world's progress is when a country is controlled by a single foreign power, to the exclusion of others, as Russia would control Manchuria, and not where a power freely opens up neighbor countries to the trade of the world.

If Anglo-American civilization is based on the principle of the enlarge-

ment of individual initiative, the free action of the people, and an equal opportunity for all, then the Japanese have been the foremost bearers of that civilization to their neighbor. In the cause of that civilization Japan was not slow to march with the allied army of the western nations, in a punitive expedition in 1900, against the very people with whom some treacherous diplomat in Europe has said that she will make a racial alliance against western powers if she is victorious in the present war. Among many things which the Boxer outbreak in 1900 demonstrated to the world, one not the least, was Japan's readiness to uphold western civilization at whatever cost, and with supreme disregard of the question of race or color.

With a record like this, and with the moderate and equitable spirit recently shown by her in the negotiations with Russia, by which she hoped to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the Manchurian and Korean difficulty, Japan has surely proved to the world that her victory in the present war would mean an open door in China, and, in the end, a full opportunity for the spread of western civilization in the Far East. In fact, the present war, in its last analysis, may be characterized as an inevitable conflict, on the eastern coast of the Pacific, between Anglo-American civilization, as it has been inspired in the Japanese by England and America, on the one hand, and Muscovite despotism on the other.

When two such radically different elements are at strife, no compromise between them is possible; one must eventually obtain complete supremacy over the other. But that, in the event of Japan's victory, this supremacy should take the form of a monopoly of the commerce or industry of the East, there is absolutely no reason to suppose. Japan's main endeavor in respect to Manchuria is to break down all such barriers, and when that country has its ports free to the world's trade like Sou-Chow, Han-Chow, Sho-Sei, and Chang-King, the chief gainer will be the nation that commands the largest capital, and has the most pluck to push. Geographically situated as America is, and with her enormous resources, unlimited capital and tremendous energy, it is not difficult to see that Americans, who claim the credit of initiating the "open door" policy in China, would rush into a vigorous contest in this new field, while Japan, her finances crippled by a costly war, would be in no position to compete with her commercial rivals. In the present war Japan is fighting, incidentally, to obtain a market for whosoever is capable of taking advantage of the situation.

The stand taken by the American government as to the "open door" of China has been much applauded of late as initiative, but as yet it has not gone beyond the sphere of diplomacy, or been backed up by tangible measures, while Japan, though fully awake to the magnitude of the task,

and hoping for no selfish economic gain, has been nerved to her great fight, by which this "open door" policy of China may be made an accomplished fact. One of her prime desires is to establish permanent peace and security for all legitimate interests in the Far East.

But this outcome of the war is possible only if Japan shall emerge from this struggle crowned with the laurels of victory. What will happen in the event of Russia's success is perfectly well known from the words of Russian diplomatic agents. Russia has already stated her demands upon China, that "no portion of Chinese territory in Manchuria should be sold or leased to any but Russians; that no new ports should be opened in Manchuria to foreign commerce, or consuls received there without previous consultation with the Russian government; and that all forestry, mining, and other similar valuable concessions should be granted only to Russian subjects." A more distinct repudiation of the "open door" policy could not be made.

The outcome of this war remains uncertain, but some things have been made clear that were not well understood before. Our Red Cross Society's work, with its tender and unremitting care for wounded soldiers, Russian as well as Japanese, has been all that could have been looked for from the highest type of a Christian people. The Japanese are considered a heathen nation, but they are doing the work of Christians, irrespective of sect or creed, without discrimination between friend or foe, and this has brought our people into closer and more friendly relations with foreigners living among us.

As is well known, by the text of our constitution every Japanese subject has perfect freedom of religious belief and action, a privilege denied to the subjects of Holy Russia, which assumes to stand so much higher than Japan in the plane of religion and civilization.

This freedom, of course, has given unusual opportunity for the work of Christian missions, and though it cannot be denied that this work has sometimes been entrusted to inadequate agencies, yet the general purity of intention is undoubted, and the success of the endeavor has been very marked. In the present critical position of Japan the opportunity for Christian teaching has been greatly enhanced. In times of distress and anxiety we all know how one true, friendly word will speak louder to the heart than a thousand of the ordinary commonplaces of good will. The man who says, "Take courage, I stand with you, I recognize the justice of your cause," has a claim upon us forever after. We are ready to listen to his advice and to accept his instruction. We all know that the grand

thing in seeking to lift others to a higher level is, first to understand them and to sympathize with them.

It is in behalf of civilization against arrogant militarism, then, that we are fighting, as England fought in the early years of the last century. Imagine for a moment what the results would have been had she been defeated. All Europe would have come under the power of a military despotism. No European country would have had left to it either political freedom or religious liberty. I may say, if Japan be defeated now, that the spirit and the principles of Anglo-American civilization will be obliterated from a vast portion of the eastern world. And it may be that centuries will pass before ever again humanity, and the universal brotherhood of Christianity, will dawn over the horizon of the continent of Asia.

MODERN ARCHITECTURE OF FRANCE

ALEXANDRE SANDIER

ARCHITECTURE is the expression of the needs of each civilization. Hence it constantly changes with each race, each generation, and each social state that humanity passes through; it follows the history of nations step by step. Therefore, in order really to understand our modern art, it seems necessary to take a rapid glance at its development in the past, and at those broad historical facts which are the primary causes of its different manifestations.

We shall see that a clearly defined architectural style corresponds to each of the broad divisions of our history; that the builder is always the faithful servant of his age, and that his art has closely followed our civilization from the Gallic period until now.

Architecture has left upon our soil but few traces of the age preceding the Roman Conquest. We know only that the Gauls had frequent relations with the ancient civilized world. The influence of the Phœnicians was exceedingly great in the south of Gaul, and later, that of the Greeks was equally so. And though their buildings have been destroyed, we can still admire the delicate and sober art of our ancestors in their arms, jewels, pottery, and especially their coins, which have come down to us; we can well believe that men who knew how to fashion such objects could also build for their dwellings something better than mere huts.

Greek civilization, which was already so far advanced in the Valley of the Rhone before Cæsar's time, would doubtless have spread throughout the country, even without the help of the Romans. Besides its temples, Mas-salia¹ possessed circuses and theatres, and was famous for its schools, in which philosophy, medicine, eloquence, etc., were taught.

As for the megalithic monuments, it is to-day admitted that they are of a much earlier epoch than the Celts and are therefore in no wise *Druidic*, as they were so long called.

After Cæsar's conquest of the Gauls, Augustus made Roman civilization spread rapidly through the country. And in this civilization especially we find architecture to be a result of manners and social conditions. The Roman people must have temples, basilicas, baths, aqueducts, theatres, amphitheatres, circuses, and monuments to commemorate their victories and triumphs.

¹ Marseilles.

Many of these buildings are still standing, and bear witness, either to the grandeur and power of Rome, or, as in the case of the amphitheatres, to the harsh and cruel character of a people that demanded battles for its pastimes and must have the image of war constantly before its eyes. Then, with the decadence, the idea of combat disappears from the arena, and its sole remaining attraction is the sight of torture and pain.

In all these monuments, except the temples, which continue to be purely Greek in form and construction, we find the Roman vault in combination with the Greek orders. Sometimes the column is transformed into a buttress, and loses its proper rôle of an upright support, as in the amphitheatres; sometimes, as in the baths, the Greek orders are plastered upon the brick-built Roman structure, simply for decoration, and could be taken away, or collapse, without injuring the structure or diminishing the strength of the building.

Thus the Roman architects soon come to see in the Greek orders nothing but decorative forms, and to forget completely the constructive principles which gave rise to these forms, and the different epochs which created them. This error even makes them go so far as to place these orders one upon another, when they have to erect monuments composed of several stories; they do not hesitate to set the Corinthian upon the Ionic, and the whole upon the Doric, though these are three completely different styles, created at different epochs.

This heresy will return with the Renaissance, and is taught even to-day as a dogma.

After three centuries of existence, the Roman Empire, invaded on all sides by the barbarians, is divided into the Eastern and the Western Empire. Then we see art fall into complete decadence. The Christians join with the invaders in destroying the pagan temples, tombs, and statues, and all the monuments with which Roman art had covered the surface of Gaul.

The destruction was complete by the end of the fourth century, and the Christians, whose religion had just been recognized by the State, had to seek among these ruined buildings for those which might best suit the needs of their cult. Not wishing to worship in the temples of the false gods, they chose the basilica; and this structure, with its portico, its three naves, its transept, and apse, will serve as the type of all Christian churches.

Next, we enter upon the Merovingian period, during which the decadence is so complete that not an architect can be found, nor a workman, capable of drawing and cutting a moulding in stone. The kings and nobles house themselves as best they may in what is left of the Roman monuments;

the Baths of Julian are occupied by Clovis and his wife Clotilde, and later by Childebert. If any building whatever is done, it is only by the use of fragments taken from some ruin; no one dares to build a vault; even wood-cutting is almost forgotten; and this state of ignorance and barbarism will only go on increasing till the time of Charlemagne.

This emperor understood that literature and the arts were indispensable to help him in organizing and reforming the peoples he had conquered; but to find teachers, artists, and scholars, he was obliged to ask them of the Byzantines and of the Arabs. He sent for architects from the East to build the famous Chapel at Aix, with its granite and marble columns taken from the churches in Rome and Ravenna. This royal chapel was soon surrounded by palaces, and all over the empire there arose cities and monasteries, of which, unfortunately, only a few remains are left to us.

But the time was not ripe for the unity of Europe, or even of France; the empire ended with the emperor; the diversity and incompatibility of the races that had been held together by his powerful hand, far more than the incapacity of his successors, brought about its dismemberment. Moreover, we still had two invasions to undergo; for a full century the Norman fleets laid waste the north, while the Saracens ravaged the south.

In such times everyone thinks first of self-defense. Resistance is organized everywhere. "The farmhouses," says Henri Martin, "and the wooden villas of the great Frankish Vassals are now transformed to donjon-keeps of stone and brick; all the abbeys are castles, each country landowner makes his house a fort; on every hill of France rises a battlemented tower." The Normans themselves build entrenched camps to protect their booty; and in 911, Charles the Simple having given up to them the province since called Normandy, they establish themselves upon our soil, become bold and industrious builders, and cover the land with architectural monuments, and especially with impregnable fortresses.

To all these calamities that mark the end of the Carolingian epoch, a third is added: fear of the year 1000, fear of the end of the world and the last judgment. All activity is stopped, everyone prepares to die, and, to appease the anger of Heaven, everyone bequeaths his lands and châteaux to the churches and monasteries. The first day of the year 1000 comes, the first month passes, then the whole year; nothing changes in the order of Nature; the terror is gradually calmed, and fear gives place to the most ardent faith.

The basilicas are rebuilt from bottom to top; throughout all Christendom, "You would have said that the entire earth, with one accord, had

put off its former rags to clothe itself with churches as with a garment of white.”²

At the moment when the Capetian dynasty replaces the descendants of Charlemagne in France, the religious orders are about to take on an immense importance, over against the feudal order. They succeed in drawing the people to them, and in guiding the progress of civilization. The monks, in the quiet of their cloisters, were the only men of this epoch who could give their time to literature and the arts. And at their hands architecture receives a new impulse and vigor unknown for many long years. From the examples of Roman architecture left upon our soil, they borrow the barrel vault, and through it they arrive later at the ribbed vault; from Byzantine architecture they take the spherical vault upon pendentives. For two centuries, this Romanic style makes steady progress, and reaches its height toward the end of the twelfth century. St. Front de Périgueux and the Cathedral of Angoulême are its best examples of domed churches; Notre Dame du Port, at Clermont, shows us the use of the barrel vault, skilfully buttressed by the half barrel vaults of the side-aisles; and finally we get the ribbed vault, in the marvelous church of Vézelay.

At the end of the twelfth century, we enter upon the most brilliant period of French architecture. This evolution of art corresponds, as always, to a political evolution. Letters and arts will now come out from the cloister, and go abroad among the people; cities are to become independent, constitute themselves into communes, and win back those municipal institutions which they had been deprived of since the Roman epoch. Corporations or guilds of citizens, artisans and artists, are formed, and erect all the buildings which the age has need of: churches, hospitals, palaces, fortresses, city halls, etc.

These masonic guilds, with their strict organization, are destined to create a new type of architecture, and for three centuries to cover France and Europe with inimitable masterpieces. As early as the beginning of the thirteenth century, this style is fully organized and in possession of all its resources. “The whole system consists,” says Viollet-le-Duc, “in a framework which is held up, not by its own mass, but by the combination of oblique thrusts counterbalancing each other. The dome is no longer a crust or shell in a single piece, but an intelligent combination of pressures which are discharged upon certain supporting points arranged to receive them and carry them to the ground.”

² “Erat enim instar ac si mundus ipse excutiendo semet, rejecta vetustate, passim candidam ecclesiarum vestem indueret.” Rudolphus Glaber, *Historiae sui temporis*, III., 6, *De Innovatione Ecclesiarum in toto Orbe*. (Tr.)

This period of art begins with Notre Dame of Paris, and ends with the Church of Brou. It gives us the Sainte-Chapelle, Rheims, Amiens, Chartres, Laon, and many other masterpieces.

Later this architecture, of such wonderful skill and so thoroughly French, will be called barbarian; that word not being thought insulting enough by its detractors, it will receive from an Italian (Vasari) the disdainful title of *Gothic*, and this expression will be adopted by the French themselves.

Those who gave this name to the art of the Middle Ages also decreed that it was in complete decadence when the Italian Renaissance reached us. In fact, nothing is more false; to convince ourselves that we had nothing to ask of the foreigner in order to go on creating beautiful works, we have only to glance at the monuments of the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the sixteenth. We shall see the Church of St. Maclou, and the Court-house, at Rouen; the tombs, with their decorative screens, of the Dukes of Bourgogne at Dijon; the sculptures of Claux Slutter at the Chartreuse of the same city; the Church of Brou at Bourg; and finally, in the Louvre, those masterly statues from the Château of Chantelle (Allier): Saint Peter, Saint Susan, and especially Saint Anne with the Virgin Child.

But another development takes place; royalty has become all-powerful, and its will is law. Charles VIII, Louis XII, Francis I, going down to Italy, are struck with admiration at what they see there, and on their return to France think of nothing but building palaces like those they have admired. Our French artists, while drawing inspiration from the classical details and decorative mouldings, preserve their originality and freedom; they succeed in transforming and nationalizing the elements which are brought back from Italy, so as to make of them a French style entirely different from that of the Italian Renaissance. The monuments necessary to this age are châteaux and palaces, rich and sumptuous. So we see built the châteaux of Chambord, Blois, Fontainebleau, Madrid, Ecouen and Anet—to mention only the principal ones—and in Paris the Palaces of the Louvre and the Tuileries. Then, too, the kings and nobles ask of the artists tombs that shall be worthy of them, and among those which were built the most remarkable are those of Louis XII, Louis de Brézé, Georges d'Amboise, Francis I, and Henry II.

Under Henry III, the religious wars and the Massacre of St. Bartholomew check the Renaissance impulse, and it steadily grows weaker from that time until Louis XIV.

This King, the inaugurator of absolute monarchy, demands unity not

only in ideas, but also in forms. Having found in the painter Lebrun an artist capable of creating the stage-setting needed for his reign—which is merely one long dramatic spectacle—he appoints him dictator, so to speak, of the fine arts. For more than a quarter of a century Lebrun is to be the supreme judge and arbiter of all artistic questions. It must be admitted that this unity of control gives birth to a sumptuous style which even to-day still dazzles us.

It was harder for him to find an architect; Louis Levau, to whom Colbert had given the task of completing the Louvre, proves to be beneath his mission; so Bernini is sent for, at great expense, to come to France, but luckily does not stay long—long enough, however, to demolish the foundations laid by Levau and to begin work on his own plan. His extravagant conduct and his disdainful vanity make a disagreeable impression, and he soon finds himself forced to return to Italy. Then the plan of Claude Perrault was accepted, and he in his turn demolished Bernini's foundations, and built the famous Colonnade which we all know.

The King was vastly pleased with it, and it was long looked upon as the last word of architecture. And, in fact, it certainly was in harmony with the literature, the manners and the ideas of its century. Still, is this colossal order really fitted to the building materials of our country and climate? What are we to think of these columns built in small horizontal layers, and of these lintels formed of a flat vault which can be held up only by the support of an iron trussing, instead of being made of a single block of stone, as was the case in ancient architecture? The whole is only an immense decorative portico, serving no purpose, offering no protection from rain or sun, and bearing no relation to the height or the arrangement of the rooms behind it, so that a good part of its windows are sham windows.³

If I have spent some time in discussing this monument, it is because of its enormous influence upon succeeding structures. It is a type which will serve as model up to our own time; it marks the beginning of our modern architecture.

But the Louvre was soon abandoned for Versailles. The Château of Versailles, though begun by Levau, is rather the work of Hardoin-Mansard, in whom the King had at last found an architect capable of carrying out his ideas.

Here, more than anywhere else, Louis XIV stands revealed; all the

³ One strange fancy of this doctor architect was to make the two inclined cornices of the great central pediment each of a single block of stone 18 metres long.

arts are here united in a complete whole, thoroughly in harmony with the pride and presumption of the *roi-soleil*.

At the death of Louis XIV, the reaction which takes place in manners and ideas influences our art also. What dominates at that time, and what chiefly characterizes the different styles of the eighteenth century, is domestic architecture.

Life becomes more secure, city and country are no longer exposed to unexpected attacks, nothing now hinders the development of domestic architecture. Everyone wants space, air, and light; already at the end of the seventeenth century the nobility had built up the Faubourg St. Germain with its palaces; it is now the turn of the middle classes. From now on, the architect deigns to consider the interior arrangement and the distribution of rooms. For the first time, the bathroom, the back stairway, and all that makes a house practical and pleasant to live in, appear upon architectural plans. As a result of this change, light woodwork of perfect taste, fanciful and infinitely varied decorations, are substituted for the heavy and solemn architecture of the preceding epoch. Then, too, more frequent relations with the extreme Orient, by giving our architects some knowledge of Chinese, Japanese and Persian objects of art, introduce into their designs yet more of the fanciful and unexpected.

But the very exaggeration of this Pompadour style brings a strong reaction, and there is a sudden change from twisting and wavy lines to the severe straight line.

Moreover, the *rocaille* style, of which Appénard was the father, thrived rather in the interior of residences and in private buildings, and never had much influence upon our public monuments.

At the beginning of the century, Robert de Cotte finishes the Château de Versailles and the dome of the Invalides, which had both been begun by his uncle, Hardoin-Mansard. Gabriel builds the Military School, and then, some years later, the two monuments which bound the Place de la Concorde on the north and which are copies of the Colonnade of the Louvre, but superior to their model. Servandoni erects the immense portal of St. Sulpice—a colossal line of columns, also sustained by the help of iron, and having no relation to the internal arrangement of the church; and, finally, Soufflot builds the Church of Ste. Geneviève, finished later by Rondelet. At the end of the century Louis builds the theatre of Bordeaux and the galleries of the Palais-Royal.

We have now come to the time of the French Revolution; all construction is interrupted, and is not taken up again until the time of the Empire.

And what could Napoleon build? Only triumphal arches and the Temple of Fame.

The Restoration does nothing but finish these monuments, changing the Temple of Fame, however, to a church.

So we come at last to 1830, the moment when our modern architecture, which is the more especial subject of this paper, is to begin.

The great movement, known as the Romantic Movement, which takes place at this moment in literature and in art, has its echo in architecture also. The authority of the Academy, which since its creation had decided every question relating to art, is to be disputed; the principles it represents will no longer be accepted blindly as dogmas. People begin to see that there is in our art something more than the Greek and Roman forms.

We have reached an epoch when people stop before going further, to look back over the road by which they have come, and to analyze the past; they perceive with astonishment that several centuries of our national art had been wilfully neglected and set aside. Scholarly archæologists, under the lead of Caumont, who was soon followed by Du Sommerard, Vitet, Mérimée, Victor Hugo, and others, made known to astonished France all the riches of her architecture.

Among architects, Lassus and Viollet-le-Duc are the leaders of the movement. The latter reveals to us by his books that architecture which from the twelfth to the sixteenth century had covered our land with masterpieces, and at the same time he shows us how to re-discover the rules and principles which shall lead us to an art genuinely new and genuinely adapted to our needs and our building-materials.

On the other hand, these archæological studies, and the enthusiasm for the works of the past which they arouse, will bring with them an evil from which we are still suffering to-day. They will overwhelm us with engravings, with books, with plans, which set before us the monuments of all lands and all ages. The books on architecture which, until then, barely filled one shelf in a library, will now fill a whole room. The modern architect, his head crammed with all these documents, will become incapable of creating from within himself anything original; he will soon be a slave to his memory; it will become impossible for him not to remember; and even when he thinks he is creating he will only be drawing, unconsciously to be sure, upon the forms and styles of all kinds that are accumulated in his brain. One will take for his model the monuments of the time of Louis XIV; another, the Church of St. Front de Périgueux; still a third, the Château of Blois; and a fourth will have such facility in assimilating the forms of the past that on his return from Rome, where the Academy has sent him to

study the remains of the Roman palaces and temples, he will build one church in the style of the fourteenth century, another in Romanic style, a third that reminds us of the Renaissance banqueting-halls, and finally a temple whose decorations will consist chiefly of Ionic columns.

Viollet-le-Duc admirably summed up the state of architecture in France after 1830, when he said: "Up to the time of Louis XIV it had been a swift and fruitful river, of varied course, sometimes spreading out broadly and sometimes confined in a narrow bed, drawing all springs to itself, and interesting to follow in its many windings. Under Louis XIV the river becomes an immense lake of stagnant water, admirable indeed for its greatness, but carrying us nowhere, and wearying our eyes by the monotony of its aspect. To-day, the dykes are broken, and the waters are escaping unrestrained in every direction by a hundred outlets. Whither will they run? No one knows."

How, then, can we follow and study all these currents? Architecture no longer follows any one general direction, or any one principle; it is as if bewildered. For a full half-century—a strange phenomenon, unique in its history—it will turn back upon itself and try to resurrect all the styles it has produced in all ages and among all peoples. The architect may perhaps be able, by his science and erudition, to draw up the plan of a church in thirteenth or fourteenth century style; but where will he find the stone-cutters, the sculptors, and the glass-workers capable of putting his plan into execution? Therefore, he will have to abandon such stone-cuttings as demand too much skill, he will have to abandon the sculpture and the stained-glass windows—in short, all that gives life and soul to our ancient monuments; and what he will produce will be only a ghost.

Architects will also try, here and there, to copy the Hôtel de Ville of Paris; abandoning, however, its freedom of arrangement, its irregularities, its departures from symmetry—all that gives the model its charm.

Theatres, museums, and court-houses will borrow their architecture from the colonnade of the Louvre, or from St. Sulpice.

As for private houses, they will be in the style of Louis XIV, XV, or XVI, according to the fashion of the moment, unless they are in Pompeian or Moorish style. If we enter these houses, we shall find a Renaissance hallway, a Louis XV dining-room, a Louis XIV reception-room, a Louis XVI bedroom, and a Japanese or Moorish or *art nouveau* smoking-room; for *art nouveau*, as the public understand it, is only one more style to be added to the list—one for which it is now the fashion to find a corner somewhere in the home.

Meanwhile, in the midst of this anarchy, two tendencies soon become clear, and two irreconcilable camps are formed.

In one we find all those who worship classical form exclusively, who insist that to it all materials must yield, to it all structural needs must bend; those who let themselves be guided by fixed formulas which they accept without examination. In the other camp we find those who hold the contrary opinion; who believe that form is a logical result of the materials used and of the needs of the age; that the Greek forms, which were conceived for columns often monolithic, and for unbroken architraves reaching from one column to the next, cannot be suitable for our materials which compel us to build the column in courses of no great height (thus making it look more like a small tower), and to transform the architrave into a *flat vault*—the very name alone proving the absurdity of what it expresses. Of these two theories, the first has lasted from the time of Louis XIV until now, and will continue to be maintained by the Academy, or rather by the academic spirit; the second theory will be defended, not only by Viollet-le-Duc and his school, but also by such members of the Institute as Labrousse, Baltard, and to-day Vaudremer.

As early as 1850, Labrousse has the audacity to use iron without concealment, and frankly to take advantage of all its merits. The very idea, simple as it is, of giving to this material the forms which befit it, leads him to create buildings of an entirely new aspect; the Library of Ste. Geneviève, and the main reading-room of the National Library, will continue to be types and models for the architecture of the future.

Baltard, who had begun the rebuilding of the Paris Markets with a heavy wing of masonry, perceives in time that he is on the wrong track, and, abandoning stone, he seeks the solution of his problem in a rational use of iron. He thus creates a type of edifice which will be copied by every city which has a market-place to build. Neither does he fear to use iron freely in the structure of the Church of St. Augustine.

With these two creative architects I will mention also Charles Garnier, who, though remaining faithful to the Roman traditions, was still able to build the Grand Opera in a thoroughly individual style. So that in this century, which has seen the art of music raised to so high a plane, it is the temple dedicated to that art which remains our richest, most important, and most magnificent monument. The whole interior arrangement of this building, which is in itself excellent, is made clear and evident by the exterior. And, though its chief façade may be criticised for recalling by its general aspect the public buildings around the Place de la Concorde, we can

answer that this arrangement is here justified by the plan, instead of being a mere architectural decoration as it is in other buildings.

To-day, after many years of strife between the two parties, the *Académie des Beaux Arts* is more powerful than ever, and the ideas which it represents will long dominate in France.

The *Académie d'Architecture* was founded by Colbert, in 1671. Its members were at first appointed by the King, up to 1717; from that time on, the academy was allowed to fill its own vacancies, by election. Under this system, no opposition could be raised, no new idea could be produced; so there was no disturbance of the calm and tranquil life which reigned in the bosom of this assembly up to the day of its suppression, August 8, 1793.

Two years later, August 23, 1795, the Convention reëstablished the *Académie des Beaux Arts*, as it still exists today; and, as before, it still fills its own vacancies, by election. The result of this system of self-perpetuation is that the spirit of this body can change only very slowly; all the more, since no candidates except those who have won the *Prix de Rome* in their youth have any chance of election.⁴

The *Académie des Beaux Arts*, which is Class IV of the Institute of France, and is subdivided into five sections (painting, sculpture, architecture, engraving, and music), controls the teaching in the *Ecole des Beaux Arts*, in the Conservatory of Music, and in the School of Rome. It arranges the competitions for the *Prix de Rome*, and judges their results in committee of the whole. Thus architecture is judged by the painters and the musicians as well as by the architects, who, however, in their turn, judge the compositions of the musicians.

Napoleon III had let himself be convinced by Viollet-le-Duc of the need of introducing some reforms into the teaching of the fine arts. In 1863 he tried to take away from the Academy some part of its privileges. The competitions for the *Prix de Rome*, for example, were judged by a jury of nine members for each section (painting, sculpture, architecture, engraving, and music), chosen by lot from a list made up by the Advisory Council of Higher Education, and approved by the Minister of Public Instruction. Moreover, the jurors of each section judged only the competitions of that section for which they were appointed.

At this time more importance was given to the study of structure itself; and great dissatisfaction was aroused by the introduction, among the courses given at the School, of a course of lectures on French Architecture in the

⁴These are the names of the eight architects—all of them winners of the *Prix de Rome*—who are now members of the Academy: Bernier, Daumet, Moyaux, Nénot, Normand, Pascal, Vaudremer and Girault.

Middle Ages. But Viollet-le-Duc, appointed to give this course, was from the first treated outrageously by the students, who were urged on to it by their other instructors. Violence and insult went so far that the distinguished architect was compelled to beat a retreat.

Unable to make himself heard, he then published what he had to say in his *Conversations*, which so well sum up the theories of his school, and which have become, so to speak, the philosophy of architecture.

The reforms forced upon the Academy by Napoleon III lasted until 1870. Since that date, the Academy has gradually recovered all its official influence over state education, and is to-day in complete control of it.

To be just, however, we must say that the spirit of the Academy has changed somewhat since 1830; in spite of itself it has felt the influence of the opposition camp; it has become reconciled to the Renaissance; and even the Romanic style finds grace in its eyes, at least for church-building.

Moreover, we must call attention to an event which has passed unnoticed, but which, however, is of great importance. The course of *French Architecture from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century*, which raised such storms in 1863, has, since 1892, been given at the *Ecole des Beaux Arts* by M. Paul Boeswillwald, with the consent of the Academy; the Academy, however, demanding that students should be free to attend these lectures or not, as they pleased, and that they should have no examinations to pass on the subject of this course.

In addition to holding this control over education, the Academy has become advisor to the State upon artistic questions. The Government, composed of officials who have no knowledge of architecture yet who often have to decide very important matters concerning the restoration or building of an edifice, naturally turns to a Commission made up of members of the Academy or of former winners of the *Prix de Rome*, and thus of course representing official art, before coming to a decision. Thus the Government shifts the responsibility from its own shoulders.

Such a Commission will recommend to the Government, to take charge of the work, some member of the Academy, or a winner of the *Prix de Rome*, or simply a student who has graduated from the School with high marks, according to the importance of the matter in question. Even the appointments of architects to take charge of our historical monuments, which formerly were given only to those who had made a special study of mediæval French architecture, are now passing more and more into the hands of the classical school. Far from me, in writing these lines, any thought of recrimination; I am the first to admire the work of an architect like Vaudremer, of a sculptor like Frémiet, of a painter like Morot, of an engraver

like Chaplain. I merely wish to bring out the fact that to-day, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the *Académie des Beaux Arts* has absolute control over all public architecture, and over the teaching of our art.

The great influence of the Academy in our time was again shown at the Exposition of 1900, for which the erection of the principal buildings was entrusted to winners of the *Prix de Rome*, after a competition which aroused a great deal of attention. The jury declared explicitly, through the official reporter of its decision, that we must keep to the lines sanctioned by time, and not try experiments in modern style.

We can hardly fail to be astonished at seeing a body of educated and intelligent men decree that certain forms are the only true, the only perfect ones, that it is useless to seek for others, and that architecture is no longer an art destined to grow and evolve, like literature, painting, sculpture or music, but a mathematical formula from which there is no escape. Our astonishment is redoubled when we find these men powerful enough to impose their opinion, not only upon our nation, but upon the peoples that make up the modern civilized world.

Are we, then, condemned to Roman architecture, until some cataclysm like the Invasion of the Barbarians shall come to deliver us from it?

At any rate, it was in accordance with the principles set forth by this jury that we built up the endless colonnade of the Grand Palais, the chief façade of which was entrusted to one architect, the rear façade to another, the side façades and the fitting together of the parts to a third, while the whole was placed under the general direction of a fourth. In spite of the recommendation of the jury, however, M. Louvet departed from the lines sanctioned by time, to plan his iron stairway, which is the only interesting thing in this immense structure.

M. Girault, on the other hand, though still following these same recommendations, was able to plan that little masterpiece, the semi-circular Court of the Petit Palais.

These two buildings had their cause for existence in the cutting of the Avenue Nicholas II, which joins the Champs Elysées with the Palais des Invalides. This Avenue, and the Bridge of Alexander III, continue the great public works undertaken in concert by the central government and the city governments more than two centuries ago, and carried on since then with remarkable persistency, to beautify our cities, to set their new buildings in good relief, and to free their older buildings from surrounding obstructions.

We owe to our own times the restoration and the preservation of interesting monuments in all our national styles. Our old cathedrals, freed at

last from all the huts which had been crowded in among their buttresses, have been strengthened and restored, and have received a new lease of life.

Broad streets and extensive boulevards have given to Paris not only air and light, but also an appearance unrivalled for beauty. All the other cities have followed this example; old and useless ramparts have fallen to give place to avenues, squares and promenades.

Beside this great decorative architecture, calculated primarily to beautify Paris and other large cities, the State has also to build Lycées, school buildings, and even factories; and for these, at least, the Government never thinks of turning to the Academy. It gets some disciple of Viollet-le-Duc to build for it structures that are simple, solid and well arranged, and the specifications for which shall not exceed the sums allotted. The Lycée Victor Hugo, designed by M. de Baudot, and the Lycée Racine, by M. Gout, are models of well-planned and economical construction. The Post and Telegraph Offices, by M. Sellier de Gisors, are also remarkable examples of simple and well-built architecture, and in spite of that, or rather because of it, of noble and imposing appearance.

If we glance now at our domestic architecture, the art in the midst of which we live, we find there no academic unity, but most varied examples, most diverse expressions, most cleverly made plans, most original—and unfortunately also most extravagant—ideas.

Once more architecture is to be the mirror of our country, remarkable among all nations for the variety of its climate, the diversity of its landscapes, and the mixture of races that have settled in it. What a difference, indeed, between the gray skies of the north and the blue skies of the south; between the rich greens of the meadows and orchards of Normandy, and the soft, delicate tints of the olive groves and valleys of Provence; between the snows and glaciers of Mont Blanc and the charming sites along the banks of the Seine and Loire! What a contrast, too, between the dreamy Breton and the exuberant Marseillaise, between the monk who would live withdrawn from the world as in the twelfth century, and the socialist who aspires toward a better future!

It is these contrasts and these antitheses which give us artists of temperaments so varied, schools which are so different from each other, and which often, starting from one and the same principle, arrive at entirely opposite results. Thus we obtain an art which wins admiration by its variety and its fancifulness, but which sometimes gives us cause to fear lest the unreflecting impulses of all these personalities may have no result but disorder and anarchy. For, beside those who intelligently seek the solution of present-day problems, we find many others who, paying no attention to the

rational use of their materials, think to discover a new style in the use of curved lines of any sort whatever, more or less graceful, but having no relation with the structure. They thus arrive at a style resembling that of Louis XV, but entirely devoid of its ornamentation. There are others, too, and they form a whole school, who ask of the plant only its stalk to compose the whole of their ornamentation. The idea is interesting, but hardly suffices to create an architectural style; it can, at the most, serve to *decorate* a few trinkets. And then, too, why deprive ourselves of all the resources that Nature offers us? Why wilfully forget that the stalk is only a support designed to bear the buds, the flowers, the leaves, and the fruit? All these new artistic manifestations, included under the English name of modern style,⁵ are only a fashion, and will have no permanence. They even serve the classical ideas which they try to combat; for public taste, weary of these lines of ornamentation traced as though by chance upon our façades, is led back to our older styles, which, under the ægis of the Academy, have always remained so good and so simple. Our eye, fatigued by all these aberrations, comes to find a pleasurable repose in contemplating the Madeleine or Notre Dame de Lorette. We must not confuse with this "modern style" the serious efforts made by some of our architects and civil engineers to seek new forms, not in their own fancies and imaginations, but in science, and in the new building materials which it now puts at our disposal. It is by rational use of these new products, it is by discovering the forms which they demand, that we shall arrive at an architecture owing nothing to the styles which preceded it, having borrowed nothing from them.

These new materials are in the first place iron and steel, next, reinforced concrete, soon followed by reinforced brick and tiling, and finally, within a short time only, reinforced glass.

I have already pointed out what excellent results Labrousse had obtained by the use of iron in the Library of Ste. Geneviève and the National Library. That was the beginning; since then we have roofed in large spaces without any supports, we have bridged rivers and valleys with a single span.

In 1899 the engineer Constamin built the *Galérie des Machines*, and roofed it in with trusses of 115 metres spread, and of very noble effect. In this building the architect, Dutert, working with the engineer, had the good sense not to introduce into the structure any more or less classical mouldings and scrolls designed to cover and decorate the iron; he had the good sense to respect the work of his collaborator and helped him only in

⁵ In French, the English phrase *modern style* is commonly employed to designate what we call, in English, *art nouveau*. This is another instance of the tendency which makes the French use *influenza* and the English *la grippe*, etc.

harmonizing and beautifying the lines called for by the mathematical plan.

In the Bridge of Mirabeau, with its jointed and balanced girders, the engineer Résal did away with the side-thrusts, and therefore with the abutments. And these new devices, arrived at by scientific planning, led him to create new forms which have been universally admired.

But his masterpiece was to be the Bridge of Alexander III, of 107 metres clear span. The principle of its construction is entirely different from that of the preceding bridge; its arches are composed of steel castings, arranged on the principle of the arch, and resting on enormous abutments. The curve of these arches is admirable, and all the engineering work deserves nothing but praise. Unfortunately, it was decided to entrust the decoration of this steel structure to an architect who, with no care for the splendid lines of beauty created by science, came and hung enormous gilded garlands on these arches, and loaded the bridge down with a mass of statues, urns, candelabra, etc., none of which has any relation to its structure and its main lines.

By citing this example I have desired to show how dangerous it is to divide the construction of any monument into two parts: that of the engineer who knows nothing of art, and that of the decorator who knows nothing of science. This is the Roman principle, to be sure; for my part, I prefer the principle that guided the Greek and the Gothic builders. It is high time that the engineer should become enough of an artist to get along without the architect, or—what comes to the same thing—that the architect should become enough of a scientist to get along without the engineer.

The necessity of being at once a man of science and an artist is becoming more and more imperative; if the architect wishes to preserve his influence over the art of building, he must give less time to the study of the arts of the past, and aim to make himself capable of handling our new materials without another's help.

But that would require a radical reform in the teaching of architecture at the *Ecole des Beaux Arts*, where, far from taking this direction, they have on the contrary reduced the study of construction to an absolutely rudimentary state. To-day the School is only a nursery in which young men are trained up with a view to the competitive examination for the *Prix de Rome*.

All the great problems of future construction will therefore remain in the hands of engineers for a long time to come. The building of bridges, viaducts, railroad stations, not to mention roads, harbors and hydraulic works, has already been taken from the hands of the architect; and if he persists in refusing to put himself on the plane of his century he will see the great works of public utility taken from him more and more, while

private works will pass into the hands of those who can build more economically than he; in a word, he will see his domain gradually grow smaller and smaller until it completely disappears.

But let us not despair of the future. Already M. de Baudot and a legion of young architects in his train have entered on this path which we are pointing out; lycées and churches and private houses are building daily by the aid of reinforced concrete, brick and tiling; and the superiority of these new materials over stone, in neatness, healthfulness, and economy, brings them new partisans every day.

What is to be the future of our art in the midst of all these struggles and efforts? No one knows. But I firmly believe that in the more or less near future we shall succeed in freeing ourselves from the Roman formulas, and shall consult only science and reason in building an edifice, and learn from Nature how to adorn and beautify it.

ERNEST RENAN AS A DRAMATIST

GEORG BRANDES

RENAN'S distinctive characteristic is an ever-increasing originality. There are minds that at their début seem to be equipped with the force and angularity of the unusual, but whose angles are gradually smoothed away by the course of their lives and the influence of circumstances. More interesting, however, are those who are only born with a disposition to originality, and whom environment and influences from without enrich and render independent, in such wise that their peculiar stamp is clearest in the hour of their death. Ernest Renan had such a mind, the full singularity of which was only disclosed during the final period of his life. In his concluding years a personality reveals itself, that had by degrees become absolutely unique.

It became so as follows: He came from Brittany, and was descended from a long line of simple agriculturists and mariners, and was early educated for the Church. He had inherited a healthy but ponderous and ungraceful body, and a keen, earnest, visionary soul, which, as it grew more mundane, was enabled to develop more and more wit. He felt strongly and keenly, lived his inner life with the energy of intenseness, was reserved and retired, outwardly bashful, and ostensibly timid; despite a quick, gifted intelligence, cultivating many a fair dream-flower in his soul, and soaring on the wings of a Celtic, legend-loving imagination.

He seemed cut out for a devout and influential priest. Catholic hymns were on the tip of his tongue; an odor of incense was diffused over his emotions, and there was unction in his pathos.

However, his studies of the Semitic languages, the philological link with the Bible, caused his boyhood's faith to waver. He became acquainted with German literature and philosophy, was enamored of Herder and enraptured by Hegel. His religious faith was soon flung out of its entrenchments. A transport of intellectual enthusiasm overwhelmed him. At first sight, his Breton Christianity seemed to have been wholly eradicated by German Reason. Not, be it noted, by early French Intellectualism, which was the forerunner of German science; eighteenth-century French philosophy, with its poverty and aridity, excited his vehement contempt. But Germany at the beginning of the century seemed to him the ideal land; a land where thinkers criticised without impiety, and denied without frivolity; a land where men were religious without superstition, and free-thinking without mockery. There doubt was not doubt, but Knowledge, hewing down

prejudices without blinking, and building up without dizziness systems of thought as high as cathedrals. German pedantry did not repulse him, for he considered it far preferable to French levity.

A faith in Science seized hold of him, as ardent as his faith in Religion had been. His youthful effusion, that heavy book, "*L'Avenir de la Science*," is a fiery confession of faith, naïf, daring, and defiant, the programme and fanfare of a new convert. There is one truth: science, and one prejudice: belief in the supernatural; he folds up this belief, as in its shroud, in the cowl he has flung off, and buries it for all time. His aim in life is to be a votary of Science; for the present he is the prophet of its future—the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory belong to it.

It was the year 1848. Renan became an optimist and socialist, and looked for the rejuvenescence of mankind and the renovation of conditions with the shortest possible delay.

These phantasms were quickly blown apart. The young man gained an impression of reality. Freedom and Republic were abolished in France by a *coup d'état* sanctioned by the people. Then it was that the first seeds of pessimism sank into Renan's hopeful disposition.

It was not very long ere the emotions of his youth rose once more to the surface of his contemplative life. His mode of feeling and his mode of thought permeated, but did not neutralize one another, as has been the case in Protestantism, where feeling has been to a certain extent rationalized, thought theologically infected. No, a wholly Catholic feeling, gentle, sentimental, at times tender, holds its own, fresh and uninfluenced, beneath a contemplative activity which, in spite of all its mildness, was daring to a rashness that nothing could dismay. Renan belongs to the large group of Romanticists that spend their lives in fighting against Romanticism.

For the rest, he remained, as a private individual, unworldly, placidly refractory, an idealist without imprudence. He got on well with each of the French Governments the last twenty years.

Renan quotes, approvingly, a friend's remark about him: "He thinks like a man, feels like a woman, and acts like a child." He felt strongly, but like women, whose hearts never run away with them, and acted in an unworldly manner, but like children, whose ignorance of life does not preclude an instinctive shrewdness.

His feeling rendered his thought supple, more supple than has perhaps hitherto been perceived, except by such great minds as Goethe's, or such keen ones as that of Sainte-Beuve. He was great at understanding the complex and the shadowy. Whereas his friend and contemporary, Taine, who had quite as decided a gift of comprehension, sought everywhere for

fundamental principles, the solid and the permanent in the variety and changeableness of the phenomenon, the osseous structures, the granite, the mountain ranges and watersheds, whence one may see life's rivers divide and rush to divers sides, Renan followed up these rivers through all their curves and windings. He shunned the crude and the decided. Others have seen, and do see truth in clear, strong colorings, see it red, or blue, or shimmering white. He never believed that it could be made prisoner within such capacious words. He saw it in *shades*, in imperceptible transitions from one color to another. And if he were a child in action, the reason of it was that one cannot act in *shades*.

But one can understand them, and the finest soul is the one that understands them with the greatest certainty. Renan was naturally fitted to see only shadows, pick out the right one tactfully, and give it its undefined name.

Truth, to him, was a butterfly. It could not be hit with blows of a club. To him, the coarse syllogisms of logic were like blows of a club.

To his childlike simplicity had succeeded the infinitely manifold receptivity of modern criticism.

Thus developed and equipped, he discovered the theme that was to become the object of his entire life's research, and one of the principal subjects of his descriptive power. Thus armed, the young individual stood face to face with the spirit of Israel. And he, the emancipated young Catholic from Brittany, lost himself in the study and contemplation of the genius that came to meet him from ancient Palestine.

He was still but little acquainted with the Hellenic spirit, and many years elapsed ere he put down in writing the prayer which, with a mixture of poetry and truth, he maintained that he had addressed to Athene at Acropolis. But this Israelitish genius, with its peculiar virility and the fire of its religious enthusiasm, struck him with fruitful admiration. He stretched out all the tentacles of his being to seize and comprehend it.

The Greeks created our civilization, our art and science, gave Europe political ideas, but they riveted his attention less than the Israelites; for they are not so present in our lives. Europe's festivals at the present day are Jewish, not Greek; Europe's God Jewish, not Greek. The book which the civilized world regards as holy is a collection of Jewish literature; the ideas of the masses with regard to duty and faith, and the life here and hereafter, have come from Syria. Europe's ideals were born at Nazareth.

All the femininity there was in Renan was attracted and over-awed by the spirit of Israel.

He was startled by the fact, that a little tribe of people, consisting, first of nomads, then of husbandmen, and of necessity extremely warlike,—with-

out navigation, for they were shut off from the sea; without commerce, which was in the hands of other races; without architecture or art, and wholly without science,—had accomplished but one intellectual achievement, left behind them one production only: Religion, or rather, two religions which in their essence were but one; for primitive Christianity only reiterated in a more generally intelligible manner what Jewish prophets had said 750 years before. The Greeks had bequeathed us social forms, fundamental ideas of science, monuments and works of art that can never sink into oblivion. The Israelites had only accomplished one thing. They had uttered so energetic, so passionate a cry for Justice that after the lapse of nearly three thousand years it is still resounding in our ears.

This appealed to his idealism, and even the fact that it all lay so far away down the ages was an additional attraction to him. There are historians who only feel at their ease when they have firm ground under their feet; they love the perceptible, the palpable. Renan, on the contrary, saw well in the dark, liked to see in the dark, preferred to peer into remote times, and felt with satisfaction their conditions and emotions come to life in his inner perception. Whether it was actually the life of those old times as it was lived then,—who can say? But, from the little we know, he imagined and divined well. He brought all his powers to bear upon vivifying the thoughts and emotions of a thousand years of that far-away past. Thereto, there exists but one means: that development of the intellect which no previous century has known, and which we call criticism.

Astronomy has the telescope. Historical criticism is the telescope that brings remote times within our reach. Physiology has the microscope. Literary criticism is the microscope which renders the mysterious psychical trait clear and explicit. The natural philosopher has his delicate instruments for measuring atmospherical pressure and heat. The critic, in his receptivity, both innate, and, as he gradually develops it within himself, manifold, possesses the barometer with which he measures the atmosphere of remote times, the thermometer with which he measures the heat of passions. The chemist has that precious instrument, the balance. The critic, in his ability to test what he has read, has a more exact balance than any that exists in the external world.

The preliminary work which Renan found done by Dutch and German scientists was admirably learned and clear-sighted. The Bible (to employ a comparison Renan once made use of) had been discovered in much the same condition as that in which the book-rolls of Herculaneum had been found. Thousands of characters jumbled up together, leaves stuck together in a pulp, the text of one page pressed into another. A task similar

to that of separating leaf from leaf had been set on foot with consummate ability, and was in full swing when Renan commenced his studies of antiquity.

As a critic, he was less of a dividing and differentiating, than of a collecting turn of mind. He drew lines between the definite points that the work of the German savants had placed in his hands. He knew the human heart so well that as a rule he saw it in every possible way, and of two possibilities picked out the probable, and among the probable explanations clung fast to the one that contained internal truth. He related, in this way, in twelve volumes, the History of Israel and the Origin of Christianity.

He went, first, straight to that which fascinated him most—the personality of Jesus. And, to get nearer Him, he took a step that no one who had wished to portray the life of Jesus had ever taken before. He went to Palestine, and filled his mind and eyes with impressions of the places and countries in which Jesus had lived and wandered.

The soil, the shapes of mountains, the courses of rivers and the beds of lakes are the same after thousands of years. In the East, moreover, the shape of the tents and houses, the style of dress, the occupations, the mode of life,—which is determined by the climate,—have remained unchanged for thousands of years; so Renan absorbed, to begin with, a vivid representation of what the natural conditions and circumstances had been, among which the religious principles of the civilized world came into being.

His Jesus is brilliantly interpreted, tenderly executed, an ivory statuette. The style lacks definiteness and greatness, but not delicacy.

Renan's indefiniteness stood, now and then, in his way,—his fondness for saying—yes and no. Voltaire had said no, the theologians, yes; as if he disagreed with both, he sometimes corroborated and denied in one breath. His respect for tradition, too great from the outset, prejudiced the first volumes of his book in particular. In them, he cannot be pronounced free from too half-hearted an adherence to his authorities. Inasmuch as he deprives the first Christian century of the Gospel of St. John as an authority, he blackens the character of Jesus in an unhistorical manner. His glance has pierced through the mists of Time, and perceived many traits that would seem to have essentially belonged to the Great Figure; but occasionally he enters too personally into his hero, modernizes Him involuntarily, attributes to Him his own favorite qualities, as for example when he calls Him the founder of "the great doctrine of lofty scorn."

Now and again, we receive an uncomfortable impression that he himself has sat for the picture.

Renan loves Jesus as he loves other great, mild men. He loves Marcus

Aurelius in exactly the same manner. He has, on the other hand, a lively antipathy to violent men, fanatics, and men of action in the religious world. Paul was as objectionable to him as Luther.

Renan grew as he handled his great subject. As his work progressed, he became more equal to it; as it assumed form under his hands, he received an ever more reassuring consciousness of intellectual superiority. And his growing superiority was accompanied by increasing indifference as to the world's opinion about him.

There gradually developed itself in him a contempt for mankind so great that it appeared good-humored, and so indeed it was.

His ever wider and freer outlook manifested itself in his constantly growing command of his material. Germany boasts sundry specialists of Renan's rank, not a few, indeed, who surpass him in learning and in strictly scientific genius. But they bury themselves in their material till their own personality is lost in it; they do not soar above it. They are bookmen, not men of the world; critics, not master-builders; inquirers and thinkers, not free intellects and free artists at the same time. But that is precisely what Renan was: a free intellect, soaring above his material and handling it in the light of his own experience of life.

He owes his playful mastery of the subjects he treats to the last great factor that determined his originality,—Paris.

Paris gave him a deep-rooted disgust for pedantry, in addition to the last-mentioned great superiority. In the end it grew to be superiority over Paris, too; but the vital thing was that the Breton had become a Parisian; Herder's disciple a Frenchman of the capital. If he were half a German till 1870, after the war and the conclusion of peace, he became a thorough Parisian and found his real youth in his old age. But the hallmark of good form in the intellectual arbitrating circles in Paris is *courteous lack of respect*.

He learnt much from individuals, much from Berthelot as a thinker, much from George Sand as an author (his landscapes remind one of hers); but he learnt most from Paris. At the last he was wholly Parisian, in so far as anyone can be called so who knows six or seven different cultures through and through, and might be termed a little culture in himself.

He began by abominating Béranger for his good-humored superficiality, the popularly Gallic style of him; he ended by being popularly Gallic himself, fatherly, and jocose, in a similar manner to that of Béranger, and with far greater potentiality.

At the last he was, as it were, a quintessence of French intellect, a condensed extract of its most delicate qualities. With the approach of age, his

superiority grew to be a kind of *serenitas*, a cloudless gaiety and clearness.

The little series of philosophical dramas which Renan wrote and published from 1878-1886 bear witness to this.

II

Although nowadays theatres have almost become places of amusement for the poor in spirit,—chiefly of the bourgeois class,—who will not, or cannot read, the dramatic form nevertheless still preserves its attractions for many. It is the most concentrated, concise form in which one can become acquainted with a story, or study from life. Whoever has two hours, and no more, to spare, will seize hold, not of a novel, but of a drama. He knows that there he will find everything that is not strictly necessary, cut away.

Others, too, than actual poets have felt attracted by the conversational form. They are the men whose thoughts move in spheres where definite certitude or certainty is not to be found, but where different opinions, convictions, and points of view can be ventilated. With the exception of the exact sciences, there is little that is unconditionally certain, very much with regard to which a great deal can be said for and against. Inside the circle of the intellectual sciences, almost everything is a subject for continual fresh inquiry. It was this feeling that made Plato write his books in dialogue form, and that led Renan, in our own day, to make use of the same. He first wrote, shortly after the cessation of the Franco-German War, a series of philosophical conversations, and later on expressed some of his favorite ideas in more definitely dramatic form. He wrote, in the intervals of his more rigorous work, four philosophical dramas, and two or three dialogized prologues.

He found his starting-point as a dramatist in Shakespeare's *Tempest*, which,—itself in the highest degree remarkable as the probable keystone of Shakespeare's dramatic edifice and deeper and more plainly symbolic than any of the poet's other works,—fascinated Renan by the emblematic nature of the three chief characters, Prospero, Caliban, and Ariel.

Caliban is the amorphous natural being, the aborigine, half-animal, half-cannibal, rude and formidable, base and stupid,—a stage on the way to becoming a man. Prospero is the future type of the highest ennobling of the human species, a being as kingly as he is full of genius, who has conquered external nature, brought his internal nature into equilibrium, and drowned his bitterness over all the injustice he has suffered in the harmony which emanates from his rich spiritual life.

Prospero rules over the forces of Nature. But instead of giving him

the traditional magic wand, Shakespeare has given him natural force itself as a subjective intelligence. This intelligence is Ariel. It would appear as if Shakespeare had wished to portray himself in that magician of the theatrical enchanted island, who has the spirit of light for his servant, and the spirit of earthiness for his slave.

This figure necessarily appealed strongly to Renan, for it fitted, in a remarkable manner, into the train of thought into which his observations of life had led him.

He had early become possessed by the idea that what is most estimable in man places him in a position of inferiority in all the mundane conditions of the battle of life.

True talent, extreme goodness, complete magnanimity, are frequently qualifications for getting the worst of it. He who cheats at play throws the highest number. He who hits below the belt, floors his adversary.

It seemed to him that the world is governed almost entirely by brutality, falsehood, and charlatanism. No wonder, then, that Prospero was driven from his kingdom.

Renan had an impression that all who work and effect anything are utilized by the world-force for a higher purpose, by virtue of what Hegel, who influenced Renan immensely, termed the Cunning of the Idea, and what he himself called Nature's Machiavellism.

The result of this idea in Renan was a settled irony of attitude. He would go on being cheated of his enjoyments, working without external reward, and renouncing,—seeing that all work demands much renunciation,—but he would maintain to the Universe,—which he is fond of personifying, old theologian as he is,—the attitude of knowing that he is being made a fool of. That is why he is so far removed from all pharisaism. He is not elated about his virtues; he knows that, being virtuous, he is victimized; but he consents to be victimized.

If Renan, in common with Hegel and Schopenhauer, believed in a Nature's Machiavellism, that implied that his mind was occupied with theories of a purpose in Nature. Now, as is well known, modern science has discarded this theory, and has only commenced to make real progress since discarding it. Science is everywhere tracking active causes, where previously, without result, she sought for design. The strength of that entire section of modern research which found its expression in Darwinianism lies in its having rendered superfluous the theory of a design in Nature. That which is most suited to its surroundings survives. This has some appearance of design, because the possibility of life depends upon the alteration which has taken place.

Darwinianism does not, however, touch upon the highest question, does not occupy itself with the original impulse of life, that energy (*nîsus*), which is the principle of motion.

Mathematics, it is acknowledged, are a vast tautology; however complicated calculations and measurements may be, there is always the same sum on each side of the sign of equation, and everything can be reduced back to the parallel proposition, $a = a$. So, too, is the Universe a vast tautology. The law of the preservation of force reveals it to us as such; no atom and no motion can vanish; all is only transposition in combustion, nothing is annihilated; the sum total is unalterably the same.

Nevertheless, the world is not at rest. For that reason Renan felt himself justified in premising a purpose in Nature, and in speaking of a divinity. This divinity is the impulse of life, and its purpose is, as Hegel said, consciousness. Nature is striving towards an ever more perfect consciousness. As Renan expresses it, the little harvest of reason, of magnanimity, of works of beauty, and of wisdom, that every planet in the course of its existence succeeds in garnering in, is the purpose of that planet, as gum is the purpose of the gum-tree. We fancy that we perceive a small balance of reason and goodness in every age, and derive therefrom a belief in progress.

But how are we to insure this progress and this final, tiny harvest?

Its fate may depend sometimes upon one man, or some few men. The development of the world can so easily be interrupted. Christian dogmatism interrupted it for a thousand years. One can conceive it interrupted by barbarism, or gross selfishness. The men who are of use in the general development are extremely few in number, easy to eradicate or paralyze. Only let one reflect how many have been annihilated by religions and despotisms, or merely by such forces as the Inquisition, in Spain, or the Government, in Russia.

It is an empty thought, that of converting the earth's two milliards of inhabitants to reason, one by one. It is not possible, but neither is it necessary. It is not a question of all men perceiving the truth, but of its being perceived by some few, and of its being handed down. The theories of Abel are none the less true because there are only a hundred men in the world who understand them. It is unessential to Truth that the universe should acknowledge her as such; they who do not understand can only bow before her.

The highest culture can neither be understood nor honored by the many. The thing is to protect it from the many. In the old days danger came especially from the Church. Nowadays development is more particularly

threatened by the theory that society ought only to have the material welfare of the individual in view.

A genius is something very rare and precious. It would seem as if there were millions of men to one individual of moment to Progress, yea, as if it needed the association of thirty, forty millions of human beings to produce one intellect of the highest order. But these intellects are instinctively hated by mediocrity. Mediocrity appreciates frieze,—at best, cloth,—not lace.

Nevertheless, the great man is no luxury to Renan. He is in reality the preliminary purpose, and as far as Nature's purpose is concerned, the question is for the great man to attain power. Only by this means can the development of reason be assured.

In olden days, a remarkable man was looked upon as a magician; men trembled before him. The Brahmins ruled for centuries on the strength of the superstition that their glance was fatal to anyone of a lower caste on whom it fell. The Church, which was at one time the civilizing power, had Hell punishment for a weapon,—very effective so long as it was believed in. When Kings became the instruments of culture, they, too, received their weapons,—armies and cannon, judges and prisons. Each of them is only strong in proportion to the fear that he inspires.

The ultimate purpose Renan had dreamt of was that of providing those who carry on the development with the necessary powers to make them, as it were, magicians anew. In their hands alone would power be not odious, but beneficent. They would represent incarnate Reason, a really infallible papal power. With the formidable means that modern science would place in their hands, they would be enabled to introduce a Terrorism of Reason.

To-day, when we see dynamite in the hands of the destructive elements of society, and armies, millions strong, with their refined instruments of murder, in the power of the reactionary elements, we are already experiencing a Terrorism of brutality. Renan conceived that the alliance of all the highest and purest qualities would be invincible, because it would control even the existence of our planet. Curiously enough, he overlooks the fact that, even if it were not a chimera, the threat of annihilation of the plane would be useless, because it could not, in face of insubordination, be partially carried out.

While Eduard von Hartmann was dreaming dreams of the voluntary self-annihilation of mankind, in a similar manner, by decision of the highest men, Renan was dreaming of the threat as an instrument in the hands of

the highest beings. Beings they must be called, not men; for they it is who later on, from *Nietzsche*, receive the name of "*Uebers Menschen*."

If only the conception of development be assured, then, Renan thinks, just as the human has emanated from the bestial, so can the divine emanate from the human. It will be possible for beings to arise who will make use of men as we now make use of animals.

He has, half in jest, drawn fanciful pictures of a kind of stud of such-like supremely gifted spirits, a kind of Asgard. He seriously believed in the possibility of a higher genus of men arising, and this is the point at which Renan seeks to connect with the Shakespearean story.

Prospero is the man of the Future, the "*Uebers Mensch*." Thus Renan sees in him the first specimen of the higher humanity; the real magician.

The subject of the drama *Caliban* is Caliban's revolt against Prospero, and the victorious issue of this revolt.

The idea on which the piece turns is that every being is ungrateful; all education turns against the educator; the first move is always that of turning against him the weapons which he has taught his subordinate to use. It is so in the relations between the classes; it is so between individuals in public life.

Caliban detests his teacher, benefactor and taskmaster, Prospero. Ariel, on the contrary, worships him; for he understood Prospero's thoughts. Prospero believes that God is Reason, and he works that God,—that is, Reason—may, to an ever greater extent, make the world subject to Himself. Prospero believes in that God who is Genius in the man of genius, Goodness in the tender soul, and, above all, is the universal striving for existence of that which alone in truth exists.

The Duke at his Court is despised, the learned ruler is despised. Respect is only felt for the man who slays. So Prospero is threatened by a "Revolution of contempt."

Then we see Caliban sowing rebellion among the common people. He explains to them that Prospero makes use of them. What they must do is to get possession of his books and alembics. Caliban is asked to decree universal felicity. He promises to do so, when the time comes; later on; later on. "Long live Caliban, the noble citizen!" He receives processions, deputations, and petitions, becomes an orator, promises to satisfy everyone: We are issued from you, we will work for you, we exist with you.

In the evening he lies down to rest in Prospero's bed. He thinks to himself: "I was unjust to Prospero. What a craving for enjoyment! What an impulse to revolution! A government ought to resist! I will resist."

He is supremely conservative already, perceives that castles, court festivals and regal luxury are the embellishments of existence.

As artists and authors are an honor to a kingdom, he will promote and encourage Art and Literature. But the centre of all his cogitations is Imperia, the lovely courtesan,—well known from Balzac's *Contes Drôlatiques*—who, at a festival in Prospero's palace, at which moral views were being discussed, had defended love. He would like to make her nearer acquaintance.

Prospero soon learns that Caliban, his animal, has become his successor. Ariel's phantasmagoria have proven ineffectual against Caliban's hosts; no one any longer believes in them, and the rebels are using Prospero's gunpowder and engines of warfare themselves. At the consultation as to what is to be done, Renan voices his doubts of the efficacy of universal education by placing in the mouth of Simplicon the reply: "Universal and compulsory education will put everything right." But it is the moderate Bonaccorso who gives utterance to the solution: "The new government seems to be well-disposed. Caliban belongs to the moderate party already."

The Inquisition arises. Caliban protects Prospero. He is not only temperate, but anti-clerical; one good quality the more. (In France, Caliban is anti-clerical.) By degrees Caliban comes to protect one and all: the Pope, the arts and sciences, and Prospero against the papal legate. "I am not going to give him up, but make use of him."

Prospero resigns, and the moral of the piece is spoken by the prior of the Carthusian monastery: "If he were only well-brushed and well-washed, Caliban would be very presentable."

A contempt, the depths of which it is difficult to fathom, lies in this homage to the once revolutionary, but now moderate and conservative democracy. And a deep conviction of the vanity of earthly existence lies behind the story's facile play.

The courtiers, in their conversation in the second act, are trying to fix upon some permanent standpoint in life. The family,—one suggests. If so, then one must be convinced that one's family is the best, and not allow one's self to be disturbed by the fact that everyone else has the same conviction. That is prejudice now, vanity! And what applies to the family applies to one's country. One can only absorb one's self in the idea as long as one believes in its peculiar superiority.—Nay, says another, refined enjoyments are the only substantial thing.—Good, but supposing all want to enjoy?—Then we will hold them down by force of arms.—And supposing that that force should turn against whoever wants to use it?—Nay, then it will be better to hold fast to the Nation—But the Nation idea only

corresponds to that of the interests of the minority. How will one be able in the future to get the many to sacrifice their lives for the interest of the few? By enlightening them.—Not at all; just the opposite. To let one's self be killed for a thing is a great piece of foolishness, *the* most foolish thing, for it is irrevocable. Remember, millions have let themselves be slain for collective institutions such as the State, or the Church.—It is all the same; they would all have been dead by now anyhow.—When Turks and Christians get killed, they believe, if they die in a holy war, that they go to Paradise. But if the one Paradise exists, the other can't. It does not even occur to them that perhaps neither of the two exist. Vanity! . . . Look at the Turks. They are urged on to battle by means of forged bills on eternal life.—Forged bills of that sort ought to be forbidden, for they put civilized nations who do not believe in them in a position of inferiority. The roughest are the victors, and as victors, they grow rougher still.—In other words, enlightenment breaks down a nation's power of resistance. All is vanity! Philosophy, which destroys prejudices, destroys the very foundations of life.

Amidst this demolishing of recognized powers, Beauty alone stands out as an admired reality, embodied in the person of Imperia. As if in defiance, and yet not defiantly, Renan, in his drama, has made the great courtesan the representative of love and beauty. She typifies the world of beauty, as Prospero typifies the world of thought. Balzac had painted her with artistic enthusiasm; Renan recognizes her as a fully justified power in life, and deals with her as power with power.

He makes her proclaim the imperishableness of love and beauty; everything is fleeting, but the fleeting is sometimes divine. Look at the butterfly. It represents only quite a small part of the life of the grub, as the flower but a few moments of the existence of the plant. But love performs the miracle of transforming the clumsy, creeping creature into a winged, idealized being. The butterfly's life is the highest, reduced to a few hours: bloom, love, die.

Imperia appears again as the Pope's beloved Brunissende, in the drama, *Eau de Jouvence*, more frivolous, but none the less sympathetic to Renan for that. Here she is more profoundly feminine, made up of strength and weakness. She has every frailty, and yet conquers the world. She distributes all the revenues of the papal chair as her fancy and caprice dictate. So much the better! . . . is the cry. The beauty of woman is a gift of the highest order, of the same order as intellect or a noble disposition. "All ecclesiastical revenues ought to be devoted to providing dresses for beautiful women, and pensions for clever men."

Eau de Jouvence is a copious piece of work. The scene is laid at the Papal Court of Avignon, and the local coloring is very slight, not strictly historical, that being even expressly avoided.

Renan here reintroduces Prospero, still holding him up as the superior intelligence, that, for the moment, has lost his authority over mankind. His magic means have lost their power. But, weak and weaponless, he pursues his quest: the attainment of power through knowledge. He has discovered various wonderful essences, amongst others, an elixir of life, which has rejuvenating power. The Pope, who is very much worn out, after a somewhat overtaxed youth, keeps him in his vicinity in order to enjoy the benefit of the results of his scientific researches. But he has much difficulty in protecting him from the persecutions of the Inquisition.

People believe that Prospero can make gold. He does not dream of it. It would be of no use; one might just as well make lead. Rather make light out of filth, mind out of matter. And he does not doubt but that some day that will be possible; reason is filtering slowly into the world, and perhaps at last a particle of justice may even penetrate too. (Renan's whole scepticism is contained in this sentence.)

Prospero is convinced that the world is controlled almost wholly by brutality. The independent peasants in Switzerland, he says, are not vastly more enlightened than their rulers. (The irony here is keen; one was expecting the opposite phrase.) Injustice is the principle of even the every-day course of events. It brings to naught all the benefactors of mankind. They are burnt at the stake of their own discoveries, and others make use of what they have found.

One fundamental thought is enunciated in connection with this, which will assuredly have occurred to one and another before meeting with it in Renan. Prospero, who talks to Pope Clement on terms of equality, tells him frankly that he, the Pope, has disappointed him. He utters (as early as the year 1310) the significant remark: "I had dreamt of a papal power that should lead the Renaissance." Pope: "And Christianity fall by the Papacy?" Prospero: "Yes."

Renan here touches upon a question of absorbing interest to the thoughtful student of history; namely, whether the Lutheran Reformation did not interrupt and mar the Renaissance, whether the Germans did not waste it from lack of comprehension of what was going on in Europe.

What did Luther see in Rome? Very little. Certainly not Michael Angelo. He saw with horror the depraved moral condition of the ecclesiastics, saw that they took to heart neither doctrines nor evangelical precepts. That was about all. The Renaissance had in its power both the

possibility and the will to emancipate mankind from above, through the papacy. Individual Popes,—like the great Emperors of the early Middle Ages (Frederick II and the Hohenstaufens, for example,)—had headed a re-introduction of culture, after it had lain fallow for a thousand years. Then Luther came, forced Catholicism into a counter reformation, and made the papal power reactionary.

Prospero felt rightly that, by virtue of the veneration it inspired, the all-powerful papacy could have crushed nearly all the superstition and error, the head of which it was. But Renan has imbued his hero with a prophetic fear lest the papal power, terrified at its own temerity, should shorten sail and endeavor to stem the movement which it had itself encouraged.

In other words, he makes Prospero predict what really did take place, and he makes Brunissende sympathize with Prospero: "We women have the same thoughts as you. Superstition has taken away from life. We want to live it in its entirety." And she asks Prospero: "Will you not write us women a book?" Renan answers through his spokesman: "Others will do that, beautiful Brunissende; I am too old, and near my end." Hardly anywhere has Renan ventured upon such downright self-portrayal.

The Pope asks: "How is it that all the other doctors together do not give me so much trouble as you?"—"Because they work on abstractions, while I wrestle with realities."—"But even if the other doctors were to share your opinions, the multitude would not understand them. You would not get any power over Church or schools."—We hear Renan's own rankling smart in the reply.

Personal, also, is his remark when the Inquisition examine his writings, and advise him to retract this and that: "It is no use. Everything in me is heresy."—"Exactly; there is much less harm in that."—In other words, it is only shallow, isolated details that the persecutor of heretics can understand.

Despite all misfortunes and persecutions and disappointments, Prospero does not lose his hopes for the future. His theory is, that the throw of the dice which takes place deep down at the source of life, and that causes a brain to be gifted or not, a woman beautiful or not, takes place so often that the futurity of the good, the true, and the beautiful is assured. Nature has infinite time before her. It matters nothing if a hundred thousand shots miss, so long as the shots are aimed an infinite number of times and one hits the centre at last. Prospero himself is satisfied with his lot: "I was an unusual quaternary in the great lottery. The chalice of life is glorious. It is folly to complain because one sees the bottom." He has only one desire: "Do not let me see a sorrowful face,

or hear a sigh, now that I am dying." And he breathes his last, as Brunisende is giving him a farewell kiss.

The cardinals get possession of the body, have it rowed out into the Rhone, and flung into the water. "If the body is found, we will tell the people that he has drowned himself; if it is not found, we will say that the devil has carried him off."

There is a bit of real Renanesque irony in the prospect of the posthumous fame that is here opened up for Prospero. It is in the same spirit that, in the preface to his last book, he mentions the accusation that had been brought against him of having received a million from Rothschild for writing his *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*. His enemies assert it, his friends deny it. "Impartial history," he thinks, will probably take a middle course, and decide that he accepted 500,000 francs.

III

Of Renan's three first dramas, *Le prêtre de Nemi* is perhaps the most profound and the most teeming with thought.

The story is associated with a tale about Diana's temple on the shores of the lake of Nemi (*Lacus Nemorensis*), the priest of which, in order to be lawfully instituted (according to Strabo), must have slain his predecessor. Renan has imagined, in the dim ages, a priest of Nemi, an enlightened man, who has not been willing to slay his predecessor, but wishes to reform an old religion, which is contrary to reason, and then shows the result of trying to introduce a little sense into human life.

The result is twofold. In the first place, the mob, who are never satisfied with anything but a successful crime, demand a regular criminal and murderer for their priest.

In the next place, the liberal-minded priest soon perceives that he has done more harm than good with his good intentions, because he has attacked the prejudices on which his countrymen's self-esteem is based. He is attacked as an enemy of religion; but he is more religious than those who are fighting him in the name of religion. In the "*Marseillaise*" occur the well-known lines:

"Liberté, liberté chérie,
Combats avec tes défenseurs."

He reverses the expression, and exclaims: "Sacred traditions of the past! . . . fight with those who contradict thee."

In reality the priest of Nemi is only Prospero, slightly remodeled. But he stands in a fresh relation to woman. She is no longer the radiant courtesan

san: she is now the sibyl connected with the temple, who is inspired by God, that is, the priest. Carmenta is consecrated to perpetual virginity, and suffers under her fate, destined, as she is, to anoint and kiss the feet of her Messiah.

"Father," she says to him, "when I am with you and hear your words, I feel that there is life in them, although I do not always understand you, and then I am ready for any sacrifice, and accept my fate, however hard it may be. But when I am not upheld by the sight of you, I collapse." Antistius replies to her, like a true priest, that woman ought to love man, and man love God, and that the emissaries of the Divinity will, and must, be loved more than they love.

Carmenta is woman admiring man's genius, whereas Imperia and Brunissende were simply the general femininity which is admired by man.

Nemi belongs to Alba Longa, which has an old civilization of its own. Opposite to it stand the seven bare heights on which Rome, young, strong, and powerful will shortly arise. (Here there is a play upon the relations between France and Germany.)

Carmenta foretells that a time will come when the whole world will speak Latin. She prophesies that Rome has a tremendous future in front of her, far greater than that of Alba Longa. She predicts that a new religion will come from the East and subdue Europe.

She is regarded as half-crazed, and her master, Antistius, as a traitor to his country, to put such things in her mouth. No! . . . Tertius is a very different kind of patriot. He absolutely denies that Rome has any future in front of her, assumes everything that is glorious for Alba Longa, and will not hear of anything that is not, originally and authentically, of Alba Longa.

The real patriots of his sort are inciting the people to an unnecessary and senseless war against Rome, which Antistius vainly does all he can to prevent. That they may win the victory, the patriots bring him a bevy of young men whom they wish sacrificed to the gods. But the priest knows that a belief in the gods is a mockery of God, and a belief in God is a mockery of the divine. He will not sacrifice the prisoners. He says, much as Isaiah did long before him, "Be just; let goodness and reason be your highest gods." The patriots reply that it does not require a priest and a temple to proclaim truths of that sort. They hate and despise him as an atheist and a weakling.

And Antistius' opposition effects nothing. Other more orthodox and conservative and cunning servitors of the temple are willing to murder the prisoners behind his back; and even these latter,—who had resigned themselves to die,—are not in the least grateful to him for their respite. They,

too, think him half-mad and disown him. Not even those whom he releases thank him. Well may he ask himself whether it is worth while sacrificing himself for a cult of such low standing, and which is so fatally devoted to untruth. He realizes that intellectual isolation is the lot of him who rises above the multitude in intellect or temper.

Still worse to bear is his perception that the others are partly right. He knows that he is weakening his country's power of resistance by telling the truth about Rome, by destroying their belief in their national gods, and by making a breach in the barbaric custom to which his people still adhere.

Yes, he cannot even be altogether glad of his own intellectual emancipation. From the first he had felt it a great relief to perceive that mankind needs narrow thoughts; every individual must have his God, a God with whom he can converse. To the last, Antistius thinks himself scarcely justified in saying or doing anything that can hinder his people from conquering. And yet he hears it singing in his ears: "Woe to the victorious nation! . . . Nothing is more inimical to all progress; reaction follows victory. The conquering master is the worst master of all."

Those in power determine upon the priest's overthrow. They are all unanimous; there is dissension only as to the means. It is proposed that someone shall be paid to murder him. "That is quite unnecessary," says the typical noble of the piece. "It will be done. Whenever a crime or a base action requires to be committed, there is always someone to be found who will do it gratis." And he continued: "The general opinion is that every piece of meanness is paid for: *Is fecit cui prodest*. Heavens! What a mistake!" In other words, no one gains anything by it. Everyone suffers. And yet it is done all the same.

Then comes the herald, announcing: "Rome is founded." Romulus has killed his brother. The foundations of every town are laid in fratricide. The progress of the world is built up on a basis of fraternal hatred. Everything that Antistius had foreseen is now about to be accomplished. Barbarism will reign in Rome, and the drama ends with a saying of a Jewish prophet (Jeremiah LI. 58): "The people shall labor in vain, and the folk in the fire, and they shall be weary."

Finally, in 1866, Renan wrote his last dramatic work,—of a wholly different character; the only one that is not purely a drama of ideas, but approaches the general dramatic style: *L'Abbesse de Jouarre*, which created an enormous sensation, and reached some twenty-odd editions at once, the very first year,—not on account of its merits, but by reason of the uproar with which it was greeted by a certain section of the press, who declared it immoral, and a disgrace to its author. It is the only one the

scene of which is laid at a definite historical period, during the Revolution,—and it has a solitary, not very elevated idea, the right of love, under exceptional circumstances, to outstep the barriers of convention, which, under ordinary conditions, are of use.

Two condemned prisoners meet in the Plessis College prison, a noble, and a lady of high rank, the Abbess of Jouarre. He has loved her for a long time, but she, though quite sharing the ideas of the epoch, has been bound by her spiritual vows. Now he persuades her to be his. They spend the last night they have to live, together. Face to face with approaching death, the shackles which had held them no longer count. But only he is put to death. A young officer who had seen her haughty beauty before the revolutionary tribunal gets her name struck off the condemned list, and it is only her friend whom the tumbril fetches away the next morning. In her despair she begs for death, and even makes a fruitless attempt at suicide.

These three first acts, which have been played by Eleonora Duse, the great Italian actress, constitute the gist of the piece. Two others are appended, in which Julie lives, alone, with the little girl that she has brought into the world, proudly bearing her so-called shame, but, for the matter of that, met by kindness on every hand, and protected and admired by her brother. She eventually marries the officer who saved her life, and who has now become one of Bonaparte's generals. The play ends with the introduction of the Concordat, which releases her from her spiritual vows.

As is to be seen, there is little or nothing in the plot itself that can be objected to. The characters are, without exception, superior people, far above the ideas or impulses of the vulgar. But in the preface there is one daring sentence: "I often think that if men were certain that the world would come to an end in two or three days, love would break out on all sides in a sort of frenzy. Everything would be permitted; nothing would have any result. The world would drain a love-potion that should make it die in ecstasy."

It was clearly to be seen from that, that Renan set no store by renunciation for its own sake. Journalists who had hitherto paid no heed to his opinions about the relations between the two sexes, now perceived his fundamental idea,—namely, that each one's duties and virtues are determined by the exigencies of his own nature,—and thought it shocking, or pretended to do so.

And yet his thought is very simple, and well calculated to meet with approval.

It was no duty for St. Francis to be a thinker.

It would have been no advantage for Raphael to have lived a conventional life.

It was Goethe's duty to set all other considerations aside rather than that of his art.

In other words, the artist's unconventional irregularity may be a higher morality. The egotistical anxiety of the genius to accomplish all that he can, may be his highest duty. The moral superiority of the saint is genius, in its way.

The thing that matters is that a St. Francis, a Raphael, a Goethe, should be produced. *The great man* is the preliminary purpose of Nature and of human life, for it is through great men that the existence and rule of that great Being is being prepared, which in olden days was called "the Kingdom of God." When scientific omnipotence has once been gathered into the hands of good and just beings, then at last God will have become wholly good and almighty.

Until then men must regard themselves, as it were, as a hierarchy. The lesser intelligence must live the life of the higher with him. Just as Alexander the Great's attendants lived by Alexander, so the great bulk of the people must always think, and in part enjoy, by proxy. They are not for that reason unhappy. It is one rung of the ladder. The higher intelligence lives the life of the highest.

IV

Renan is not a real dramatist, and has never posed as such. His plays lack short and concentrated form, his retorts pith, and his characters, as a rule, life. His feminine figures: Imperia, Brunissende, Carmenta, the Abbess, are, it is true, interesting sketches (the courtesan, the sibyl, the proud and noble woman of the world). But he has only finished one portrait with solicitude and affection, lyrical as he is, and that is his own, the figure of Prospero, which reappears in three different plays, the seer, the higher man, in whom the future is budding and ripening.

Renan's *Caliban* reminds one just a little of Krasinski's *Undivine Comedy*, in which the unpolished democracy is similarly personified; but the spirit of that is antiquated, a half-believing, half-doubting spirit of Catholicism.

If we compare Renan's play with the one of Shakespeare's, which, after the lapse of 300 years he has attempted to continue, we see plainly enough, in the comparison, the artistic superiority of the Renaissance, and the improved science of our own age. Renan's characters are shadows in com-

parison with Shakespeare's, but Shakespeare's ideas are naïf in comparison with Renan's.

If, in conclusion, we mentally place for a moment real modern plays, like those of Ibsen, side by side with Renan's, we have not merely again a comparison between real poetry and mere idea-suggesting dialogue, but also a comparison between a psychology keen to sophistry, and a vast outlook over mankind's past and future. Ibsen's psychological insight is balanced by Renan's world-comprehending survey. Both see the dark side, but without thereby intending, or deserving, to be called pessimists.

Ibsen's technique is that of a master; in Renan there is scarcely anything that can be called technique at all, so negligently is the purely dramatic handled. But this is compensated for by the fact that there is no insistence on any one trait of character, never any harping on the same phrase ("the dense majority, the exciting"), as is necessary in the case of a man who writes for a theatrical public, which requires a certain coarse obviousness, in order to understand.

In these dramas, as elsewhere in Renan's writings, the style is perfect, melodious and rhetorically pure at the same time. All the thoughts are lightly flung out, as we fling out bubbles from a clay pipe, to amuse ourselves by watching the sunshine sparkle on their light spherical, or globe-like forms.

There is nothing massive here; everything is introduced as it would be in the conversation of a witty man, who knows how to speak seriously, and yet more than half in jest; who knows how to contradict himself, so that his hearers need not trouble to do so. There is nothing dogmatic, and nothing heavy. No aims with a club at the butterfly of truth.

Everything is reduced to tones and shades. In a word, Renan's is volatile and high-bred art, the phantasmagoria of a superlatively fine *lanterna magica*—which long delighted mankind, but is now put out forever.

THE STUDY OF THE DRAMA

BRANDER MATTHEWS

I

WHEN we approach the study of the drama we shall do well to begin by reminding ourselves that this art does not lie wholly within the limit of literature, a fact which makes investigation into its principles at once more interesting and more difficult. The novel, the short story, the epic, the lyric, the essay, can all of them be weighed and measured by purely literary tests; the drama cannot. And here it has a certain resemblance to history, on the one hand, and to oratory, on the other. There are not a few historians highly esteemed by their fellows whose works, however scientific they may be, lack art, and are deficient in those twin qualities of literature which we term structure and style. There are orators, able to move multitudes by their impassioned appeals, whose perfrigid addresses when put into chill print seem empty and inflated. So there are playwrights of the past as well as of the present, many of whose pieces, although they may have pleased the vast majority of playgoers when they were performed in the theatre, are now none the less quite unworthy of serious criticism when the attempt is made to analyze them from the standpoint of literature alone.

We may even go further and point out that a pantomime proves to us that there is at least one kind of play which can exist and achieve its purpose satisfactorily without the use of words,—and thus without the aid of the most obvious elements of literature. And we may note also that while the drama does not lie wholly within the limits of literature, it is at liberty to call to its aid other of the arts, not only the art of the actor,—with which the art of the playwright must ever be most intimately associated,—but also the arts of the musician, of the painter, and of the sculptor. It can force each of these into its services whenever it wishes, and it can borrow from them any device it may need. Not without good reason did Wagner assert that the music-drama was “the art work of the future,” since the theatre is the one place where the arts may all unite, each contributing its share to the harmony of the whole.

Thus it is impossible to consider the drama profitably apart from the theatre in which it was born and in which it reveals itself in its completest perfection. All the masterpieces of the dramatic art were planned and elaborated on purpose to be performed by actors, in a theatre, and before

an audience of the poet's contemporaries. The great plays of the mighty masters, without a single exception, were intended to be played; they were prepared primarily for the stage, and only secondarily,—if at all,—for the study. Neither Shakespeare nor Molière chose to publish his immortal plays in his own lifetime, seemingly careless, both of them, in regard to any other judgment than that which had been passed in the theatre itself. They had contrived their plots in accordance with the conventions which obtained in the theatres of their own time and with which alone they were familiar; they had fitted the chief parts to the best of their fellow-actors; and they may very well have distrusted any criticism not the result of the actual performance under the special conditions which they themselves had chosen.

As all the plays of all the great dramatists were intended to be played, the student of the drama need give no thought to the plays which were not intended to be played,—to the so-called "dramas for the closet," which certain modern poets have seen fit to compose. Whatever their value as poetry, these poems in dialogue have little claim to be considered as drama. They have an interest of their own, now and again; but they seem to a lover of the real drama to be characterized by a too easy evasion of the technical difficulties in the wrestling with which every real artist finds his keenest joy. They assume a virtue which they have not striven to acquire. When a poem is cut into dialogue and divided into acts, when the scenery is described and the action set forth in the terms of the stage, although the poet ignores the actual theatre, there is an air of unreality about it, a taint of insincerity. A closet drama of this sort irresistibly recalls a summer cottage with its shingled turret and with a parapet carefully machiolated so that the residents can the more readily pour molten lead on the besiegers. "When you build a portcullis to let in cows, not to exclude marauders, it is apt to become rather ludicrously unreal; if you know that your play is to be read and not to be seen, the whole dramatic arrangement is on the way to become a mere sham," said Sir Leslie Stephen, and, he asked, "Why bother yourself to make the actors tell a story, when it is simpler and easier to tell it yourself?"

Not only are these poems in dialogue trying to pass themselves off as plays, although they are unfitted for the theatre, but—perhaps for this very reason—they are nearly always deficient in the essential quality of the genuine drama; they do not deal directly with a struggle, with a conflict of opposing forces. M. Brunetière has brought out more clearly than any critic before him that the drama differs from the lyric, the epic, the novel, and all the other forms of literature in that it must have at the heart of it a struggle, an assertion of the human will, a clash of opposing interests. Apparently

the experience of the centuries has proved that the one thing which will retain the attention of a mass of men assembled in a theatre is a struggle, a collision of two forces the various episodes of which the spectators can follow with unfailing interest until one side is victorious and the other vanquished. In the masterpieces of the drama, ancient and modern, we can always find this stark assertion of man's volition; we have ever a hero at war with fate or with heredity, with the social law or with some merely human opponent. In melodrama we find the obvious rivalry of a very good man with a very bad man. In comedy we observe the clash of character on character. In tragedy we behold the chief figure in the fell clutch of fate, with which he must grapple in vain.

Whatever the dramatic form, wherever there is true drama, there is a struggle at the center of it, to stiffen its interest,—there is an exhibition of the human will. This essential struggle is what makes the drama truly dramatic, since it supplies the action without which there can be no drama. And the crucial moments of this struggle the born dramatist never relates at second-hand; he always presents those in action on the stage before the eyes of the spectators. It is the mark of the born dramatist, by which we can always distinguish him, that in his plays we have the contending forces brought out clearly, so that we can take sides, if we choose, before we are made to see for ourselves the successive phases of the conflict.

II

When we take up the study of any art, we find that there are two ways of approach. We may trace the growth of the art;—or we may inquire into its processes. In the one case we consider its history, and in the other we examine its practice. Either of these methods is certain to lead us into pleasant paths of investigation.

If we determine to investigate the slow development of the drama through the ages, we shall find ourselves in time better fitted to answer questions which are often very puzzling to those who do not recognize the necessity of going back into the past if we wish to understand the present. Why did the Greeks put a chorus into their tragedies? In Shakespeare's plays why do the scenes change so frequently? These are queries which many a commentator has striven vainly to answer,—simply for lack of historical knowledge. Research into the origin of the Attic theatre reveals to us that the Greeks did not put a chorus into their tragedies and that on the contrary they put a tragedy into their chorus,—since it was out of the chorus that their drama was amplified. Inquiry into the growth of the Elizabethan theatre shows us that the scenes in Shakespeare's plays do not

change frequently,—or at least that the scenery does not, since in Shakespeare's stage there was absolutely no scenery to change.

On the other hand, we shall not err if we decide to devote ourselves not so much to the development of the drama as to its technic. The basis of a genuine appreciation of any art is an understanding of its principles. An attempt to discuss architecture as separate from construction is certain to be sterile, for the beauty of architecture is often in the exquisite adaptation of the means to the end,—a beauty not to be appreciated by those who are indifferent toward the technic of the art of building. So also some acquaintance with the various methods of putting pigments on canvas is a condition precedent to any firm grasp of the principles of pictorial art. And the technic of the drama is less simple than either of these, since the architect builds in stone and steel and the painter draws with colors, whereas the work of the dramatist must be devised for interpretation by the actor. The dramatic art is really twofold, since it is the result of a necessary union of the efforts of the playwright and of the player. Neither of them is able to accomplish his purpose without the aid of the other. To achieve a dramatic masterpiece the dramaturgic skill of the playmaker must utilize to the utmost the histrionic skill of the actor.

As we seize the importance of these lines of approach, the historical and the practical, we see that a sound knowledge of the drama is not possible unless we seek to attain both a perspective of its development and an insight into its technic. Just as the study of music is most stimulating when it includes an inquiry into the value of each of the several instruments, and also into their gradual combination into the most marvelous instrument of them all, the modern orchestra, so the study of the drama is most likely to be profitable when it leads us to consider the successive modifications in the shape and size of the theatres wherein plays were acted; the varying circumstances of performance to which the playwrights had to conform; the conventions of the art, some of them shifting from century to century or from country to country, and some of them immitigable in the very nature of the drama; and above all when it forces us to recognize the real unity of history, the continuity of the art of the drama, which enables us so often to explain the past by the present and the present by the past.

If we combine the study of technic with an inquiry into the history of the dramatic art, we shall find ourselves in a condition to make many suggestive comparisons. We shall be in a position to see, for instance, that the comedies of Menander were probably in their outward form very like the comedies of Molière, and that the former varied from the latter in content partly because of the difference between the two dramatists them-

selves, and partly because of the unlikeness of the social conditions in which they were severally placed. We shall find pleasure in contrasting the comedy-of-manners as it was composed at the end of the eighteenth century in France by Beaumarchais and in England by Sheridan, arch-wits both of them and masters of inventive ingenuity.

We can also make the striking comparison between two dramatists of genius separated by a gulf of twenty centuries, Sophocles and Ibsen, discovering in the "Oedipus the King" of the one the same massive simplicity that smites us in the "Ghosts" of the other, the Greek showing how fate is inevitable and the Scandinavian seeking to prove that heredity is inexorable; Sophocles, it is true, "saw life clearly and saw it whole," while Ibsen seems to some of us to have rather a morbid liking for the abnormal; but none the less is there a startling similarity in their constructive ability and in their surpassing technical mastery. We can instruct ourselves by tracing the potent influence exerted now and again by the drama of one nation upon that of another, inquiring how Spanish pieces affected Corneille in his tragedies, how Italian plays supplied an early model to Molière for his comedies, how French comedy was the exciting cause of English comedy under the Restoration, how the English drama served to stimulate Lessing in his reform of the German drama, how the social plays of Ibsen have powerfully modified the aims and ideals of latter-day playwrights in France and in Spain, in Germany and in England. And in preparing ourselves to make these international comparisons we shall have gained a more intimate knowledge of the dramatic art.

III

An inquiry into the technical merits of a play might well begin by a careful consideration of the essential struggle, of that conflict of forces which must serve as the backbone of the action. Unless this can be disentangled sharply, we are justified in doubting whether the play would greatly interest the majority of playgoers. And they will take a keener delight in watching the performance if the dramatist has not shirked his duty, but has presented in action all the vital phases of his theme. In nothing is the instinct of the born playwright more evident than in his selection of the episodes of his story which he is satisfied to relate briefly in narrative and those which he sets actually before the audience. The born playwright feels that certain episodes the spectators will expect to see for themselves and these he puts on the stage unfailingly, never causing them to take place behind closed doors. He knows that playgoers believe what they see, and not what they hear,—and that little of what is said on the

stage is of importance in comparison with what is done. If the spectators have seen a character refuse to relieve an appealing case of distress, they will not believe him to be warm-hearted and open-handed even though every other character in the play should continually praise his liberality. The younger Dumas revealed his profound understanding of the conditions of the theatre when he made an exception and prefixed an explanatory prologue to the "Fils Naturel"; he wanted the spectators of the play to have seen for themselves how it was that the hero was in possession of a comfortable fortune.

The born playwright not only succeeds in bringing out his essential struggle by the aid of its most significant scenes, but he has the knack also of taking us swiftly into the thick of the combat, wasting no time on elaborate explanations, but exposing his theme concisely. It is necessary always for the audience to be made aware of certain things which have happened before the play begins and in consequence of which the opening situation of the piece has been brought about. Dramatists differ in nothing more than in their skill in exposition. Contrast, for example, the frank prologue of the "Captives," in which Plautus plainly tells his stupid audience all that they need to know and then goes on to repeat it boldly for fear they should not understand,—contrast this crude and inartistic exposition with the swift and illuminating scene wherewith the younger Dumas begins the "Wife of Claude,"—the darkened room in the grey dawn, the empty stage, the knocking at the door once and then again, the entrance of the old servant to admit the returning wife, and the hurried questions of the wanderer, the answers to which put the spectators in possession of the facts they need to follow the subsequent unfolding of the story.

A contrast almost as striking is that between the method of Scribe and the method of Ibsen, each in his own way a master-craftsman, each equally conscious that the interest of every important scene in a play depends largely upon the thoroughness with which the audience understands in advance the relationship of the several characters the one to the other. Complete information as to the opposing personages is a condition precedent to our interest in their debate. If we are left in doubt our attention is distracted, and while we are engaged in guessing at the unexplained facts and in puzzling out the exact situation we are unable to put our minds wholly on what is about to take place on the stage before us.

Knowing this, Scribe and Ibsen are equally painstaking in the supply of all needed information; but their procedure is as unlike as may be. Scribe gives up his first act to his exposition, introducing us to all his characters in leisurely fashion and acquainting us with all that we may need to

know about them and about their relationships to each other. Often little or nothing happens in the first act of a play of Scribe's, and the story scarcely gets itself started until the beginning of the second act. After the wheels have all been put into position carefully and all the cogs have been cautiously adjusted, then the machinery runs on to the end with the utmost precision, keeping time perfectly and striking the hours at the appointed moment. Ibsen, on the other hand, generally condenses his preliminary exposition into a single opening scene which tells the spectators what they will require to enable them to appreciate the next scene; and then in this second scene he lets out casually as it were, but with consummate art, whatever facts may be needful for the understanding of the third scene; and so on it may be till the very last scene of the final act. With Scribe the exposition is complete in the first act. With Ibsen it is sometimes not finished until just before the play comes to an end.

It is difficult to exaggerate the necessity of an exposition—whatever the method chosen—so clear that no misunderstanding is possible even on the part of a preoccupied spectator. The beginning of a play is really more important than the end, although in strict logic the proper untying of the knot would seem to be the more necessary. But if an audience has sat for three hours, following with keen enjoyment the successive episodes of a conflict between forces evenly balanced, it does not insist upon logic; it is often better pleased to have the knot cut arbitrarily than to be delayed by the process of untying. It has had its pleasure, pressed down and running over; and it is not churlish in denying to the author the privilege of finishing off the play as he thinks fit. The play itself is what counts, not the way the story is made to end. The picture of life is what the spectators have enjoyed; and they do not—or at least the most of them do not—care what moral may be tagged to the fable by which they have been entertained. Perhaps this is one reason why Shakespeare and Molière are sometimes so casual in the winding up of their plots, as though they were admitting that since in real life nothing ever comes to an end, so on the stage, even if an end of some sort is asked for, one end is about as good as another.

The audience prefers a happy ending no matter what the wrench to the logic of the situation. It is only in opera that a tragic termination is welcome nowadays, and perhaps this preference of the public for plays which conclude with the promise of future happiness for the hero and heroine, is partly accountable for the infrequency of tragedy. Yet this preference is no new thing in the history of the theatre; and we see Molière not only bringing about the downfall of *Tartuffe*, which was certain to occur sooner

or later, but also restoring the fortune of Orgon, which is in the nature of a concession to this predilection of the public for a pleasing solution. So Mr. Gillette in his "Secret Service," an admirable play in its veracity as well as in its ingenuity, carries us straight to the tragic end which is the only logical issue of the circumstances and the characters,—and then, at the very culmination, when the prompter's hand is on the bell to ring down the curtain, Mr. Gillette suddenly reprieves his hero and marries him off in the twinkling of an eye. The effect is as though the author was saying to the audience, "Of course, this play is a tragedy, and it cannot really be anything else, but, if most of you insist on a happy ending, you may have it your own way!"

IV.

If we have firmly grasped the fact that the drama has always been governed by the triple conditions of its composition on purpose to be performed—by actors—in a theatre—and before an audience we may be moved to inquire into the influence which each of these conditions exerts upon it.

As the masterpieces of the great dramatists were made in the theatre, the impress of the performers is far greater than most students suspect. The playwright profits by what he has at hand, choosing the subjects which will show off to advantage the tragedians and the comedians whose powers he has at his command and eschewing the situations which these available performers could not render to advantage. Sophocles was accused of writing his plays to fit special performers; and the accusation reveals his shrewdness in profiting by opportunity. Shakespeare—so Sir Leslie Stephen has ingeniously suggested—may have continued the vein of "Timon of Athens," not because he himself was at the moment of his life specially misanthropic but "because it suited the acting of one of his fellows." Molière describes his own wife in the heroine of the "Misanthrope," and trained her to play the part. Sheridan carefully excluded a love scene from the "School for Scandal" because the actors he intended to cast as Charles and Maria could not make love satisfactorily. Scribe and Legouv   delayed the appearance of the heroine until the second act of "Adrienne Lecouvreur" because they had determined to bring on Rachel in the costume of Roxane. And if "Cyrano de Bergerac" concludes with the death of the hero, it is perhaps in order to reveal another aspect of the incomparable virtuosity of M. Coquelin, the marvelous comedian, for the setting forth of whose extraordinary gifts the whole play was most artfully devised.

A student of the principles of the dramaturgic art ought also to acquire an insight into the principles of the histrionic art, which is so closely related to it. But these principles have nowhere been codified; and they must be

deduced by cautious inquiry. Something may be acquired from M. Coquelin's lecture on the art of acting, and something from the fragmentary essays of George Henry Lewes, an amateur performer himself and the son of a professional comedian. Not to be neglected are certain books written by the actors themselves in which they inadvertently cast light upon the methods of their art. The "Apology for the Life of Colley Cibber" and the "Autobiography" of Mr. Joseph Jefferson are invaluable, as they are also delightful. Actors, it may be recorded, are likely to write well because their calling has trained them to observe character; and it has accustomed them to the use of a vocabulary, picked, polished, and pictorial. Cibber has left us a gallery of brilliant portraits of the actors and actresses who were his contemporaries; and Mr. Jefferson has recorded his cordial appreciation of many of the richly endowed comedians with whom he has come in contact in the course of his honorable career. Although neither of them has laid down the laws of his art in set phrase,—for of a truth the laws of an art are never fixed and final,—much may be learnt indirectly from the one and from the other.

The wider our acquaintance with the principles of the art of acting the more certainly shall we be assured that the masterpieces of the drama were all of them planned to afford full opportunity to the actor. The more we know about actors and about their methods the more clearly shall we see that Shakespeare's plays, for example, were written in the theatre itself for the special performers who were his associates in the practice of the art. And here the student meets with one reward: any doubt at once disappears in regard to the authorship of the plays which are ascribed to Shakespeare. If these were written in the theatre, they were the work not of an outsider but of someone intimately acquainted with all the difficulties of the histrionic art—and also with all its possibilities. The plays of Shakespeare were composed by a playwright who knew what actors could do and what actors like to do, and who so ordered his plots, therefore, as to give his fellow-performers every possible chance for the display of their craftsmanship. Some of the technical devices which Shakespeare frequently made use of seem to us now rather primitive; but if we study the plays of his predecessors we discover that crude as these devices may appear nowadays, they were in his time often in advance of those employed by the playwrights in possession of the stage when he began writing. No one of Shakespeare's predecessors affords so abundant an opportunity to the actor as does Shakespeare himself. And here we see why it is that none of those who have given themselves to the study of the arts of the theatre,—no dramatist, no

actor, no manager, no professed dramatic critic has ever been tempted to accept the Baconian hypothesis, alluring as that has been to some persons trained in other crafts.

V

The influence of the actor upon the play is fairly constant throughout the long history of the drama. It was probably quite as much felt in the time of Sophocles as in the time of Shakespeare, in the days of Lope de Vega as in the days of M. Sardou. But the influence of the theatre itself, of the shape and size and circumstances of the playhouse upon the plays performed within it,—this is an influence which has varied greatly in the course of the centuries. The form of the drama has always been adjusted to the possibilities of actual performance; and these possibilities have rarely been the same for two centuries together; causing variations which have not hitherto received the attention from the historians of the drama which their importance seems to demand. Perhaps the consideration of them may be facilitated by distinguishing four successive phases in the slow development of the playhouse,—from the hasty platform in the market-place of a Greek city in B.C. 300 to the snug and commodious theatres of Paris and London and New York in 1900 A.D., with their realistic scenery and their elaborate systems of lighting.

In the first of these phases we find performances taking place out of doors, finally establishing themselves in a leveled space at the bottom of a hollow in a hill, so that the spectators could mass themselves on three sides, tier above tier. The noble theatre of Dionysius under the shadow of the Acropolis at Athens is the splendid type of the playhouse at this moment of its evolution. This Attic theatre was copied in the other Greek cities and in the Greek colonies; and it was modified only a little by the Latins, as anyone can see who compares the theatre of Dionysius with the later Odeion of Herodes Atticus, the stately ruins of which are only a few yards distant. No doubt much of the massive dignity of Greek tragedy, its solemn movement, its sculptural reserve, must be ascribed to the circumstances of its performance here under the blue sky before the citizens assembled to take part in a religious ceremony.

External conditions not unlike these we find in the Middle Ages and even early in the Renaissance after the mysteries had been crowded out of the churches and when they also were presented in the open air, either on long platforms before the cathedral doors, as in France or on a series of separate platforms (sometimes movable floats, termed pageants) as in England. Again the audiences were made up of all the citizens of the town, the better sort getting seats on the stands and in the balconies of the adja-

cent houses, while the poorer folk stood wherever they could find room in the streets. A noisy throng these mediæval spectators must have been, ever restless, eager of gaudy spectacle, welcoming a broad joke; and those who put together the elementary plays to be performed under such conditions could content themselves with a bold contrast of the primary colors.

The second phase is that of the half-roofed playhouses of England in the time of Shakespeare and of Spain in the time of Calderon. Although occasional performances took place in enclosed halls, the ordinary theatre in the last days of Elizabeth seems to have been modeled on the courtyard of an inn with its galleries serving as private boxes, with its inn-yard in which the groundings stood and into which there was thrust out the bare platform whereon the actors played their parts. Even if the stage itself was more or less protected from the weather by the gallery which might run across the back of it or by a penthouse above it supported by pillars, the yard was open to the sky and the standing spectators were exposed to the accidents of the climate. And what it is even more significant to remember is the fact that the performances took place by daylight, which streamed in through the unroofed area enclosed in the square of the galleries. The playhouses of Madrid were apparently not exactly like those of London, but the conditions of performance were not dissimilar, since the main space for the spectators was unroofed and since the acting was necessarily done by daylight.

Shakespeare and Calderon are generally regarded as modern dramatists; and of course they were not Greeks. But if we consider the playhouses for performance in which their pieces were devised, we must admit that they were at least semi-mediæval. Perhaps Corneille and Molière may not unfairly be called the earliest of the moderns, since their plays were written for a theatre which is characteristic of the third phase of development, when the playhouse was wholly roofed, when it was artificially lighted, and when the stage was adorned with scenery intended to represent the place where the action was supposed to pass. This scenery was scarcely more than a background and it was very poorly illuminated by a few candles or lamps. Although the stage-setting and the facilities for lighting improved during the two hundred years extending from the middle of the seventeenth century to the middle of the nineteenth, there was no change of real significance during this time except the expulsion (in the eighteenth century) of the spectators who had been allowed to occupy seats on the stage itself. Furniture became more elaborate; and there was a constant tendency toward a fuller and a more exact representation of reality. Gas was ac-

cepted as an improvement on oil; and it became in time possible to light up the remoter corners of the stage.

Then in the second-half of the nineteenth century the playhouse entered the fourth phase and took on the appearance to which we are accustomed, with its stage withdrawn behind a picture-frame and with the actors no longer in the midst of the spectators but separated from them by a straight line. In all the earlier phases the performers had sometimes been surrounded on three sides by the audience; in the Greek theatre they acted in the orchestra indented into the curve of the rising seats; in the mediæval performances much of the acting had been done in a space left vacant in the thick of the throng; in the semi- mediæval theatre of Shakespeare's time not only was the stage projected into the yard with the groundings all around it, but playgoers who could afford the extra price sat on the stage itself. So they did also in Molière's theatre. Even when the spectators were banished, the stage still extended far beyond the curtain, and all the more striking incidents of the play were presented on this "apron," as it was called, and in the full glare of the sparse footlights. In the Greek theatre, in the mediæval, in Shakespeare's, in Molière's, in Sheridan's, in Hugo's, this proximity of the players to the audience could not but incline the dramatist toward an oratorical, or at least a rhetorical, treatment of his subject. A platform is obviously the proper place for speeches.

But in the modern theatre with its electric-lighted stage cut off by the line of the curtain and often set back in an actual frame, the rhetorical treatment is not so appropriate as the pictorial; and we may be sure that the dramatist of the future will avail himself to the utmost of every pictorial possibility; he will seek to convey his thought by words, of course, but also by gesture, by the significant play of the human countenance, by eloquent silences, even,—just as the dramatist of the past found his profit in the rhetorical opportunities which were open to him. This introduction of the picture-frame is the most significant fact in the recent history of the drama; it must be accepted as the chief dividing-line between the drama of the past and the drama of the future. Now that we are at last accustomed to a theatre in which the rhetorical must needs be subordinated to the pictorial, it is only at the cost of effort that we are able to evoke a vision of a theatre in which acting was done in the midst of the audience. But unless we keep on making this effort, unless we train ourselves to bear in mind constantly the widely differing conditions to which the earlier dramatists had to conform, we are ever in danger of not appreciating adequately their skill in availing themselves of the several types of more primitive playhouse for which they prepared their masterpieces.

VI

The influence of the player on the playwright is fairly constant, since the histrionic temperament is probably now very much the same as it has been ever since the first actor made his bow and was welcomed with applause. The influence of the theatre itself is—as has just been pointed out—most variable. The influence of the playgoer on the play has been already touched on,—when mention was made of the preference of many audiences for happy endings. The fact that certain dramatists have yielded to this preference serves to show that, while the influence of the theatre itself is solely upon the manner of presenting the story, the influence of the audience is exerted rather on the story itself. And this influence is as changing as it is potent. As the dramatist has always sought to please the spectators by stimulating their emotions, he has always had to take into consideration their feelings. Now at the beginning of the twentieth century, for example, English-speaking playgoers dislike to take away with them the painful memory of a tragic termination; but at the end of the sixteenth century English-speaking playgoers seem to have preferred tragedy above all else, and the more deadly it was the better they liked it. Indeed, it was to gratify this gruesome taste that Kyd and other playwrights devised the so-called tragedy-of-blood, which abounded in horrors of all sorts, duels and murders, ghastly tortures and bloody ghosts; and so popular was this with the groundlings that even Shakespeare in his youth tried his hand at it in “*Titus Andronicus*,” and in his maturity utilized the framework of this violent but popular species in the thought-laden “*Hamlet*.”

Gladstone declared that the orator only gave out in a shower what he received in drops from his hearers; and all speakers do their best to strike as early as possible some chord which will call forth a sympathetic feeling from those who are listening. So the playwright, even though he means to present a theme unacceptable to the majority of the spectators must begin by arousing their kindly interest. And only very rarely does a dramatist appear venturesome enough to present a topic unattractive to his contemporaries or daring enough to risk a shock to their prejudices. The history of the drama is the history, therefore, of the changing prejudices of the races of mankind. It affords us most precious indications of the divergence of opinion between the different peoples and of the shifting of sentiment in the same people in succeeding periods. It is in fact an index of civilization.

For example, Professor Gayley, in his illuminating account of the rise of English comedy, has drawn attention to the significant fact that one striking dissimilarity of the mediæval mysteries performed in England from those performed in France lay in the greater elaboration which the Gallic scribes

were likely to give to the scenes between Joseph and Potiphar's wife. This same dissimilarity has lasted for now five centuries at least; and there are no signs of its disappearance. To us who speak English marital infidelity is tragic; except during the brief orgy of the Restoration it has not been considered a fit subject for merely comic treatment. To the French, it may be tragic on occasion, but it is more often comic. And here we may find the reason why so many modern French plays, ingenious in plot, brisk in movement, adroit in construction, witty in dialogue, have failed to please when they were translated into English; the undeniable cleverness may attract a few for a short time, but they never succeeded in establishing themselves solidly in the favor of the public which is annoyed by the humorous treatment of a theme it holds as fundamentally serious.

Although a study of the drama ought to begin with an inquiry into the technique of the art, it cannot be kept within these narrow limits; sooner or later it will demand a consideration of racial traits and of national characteristics. And the drama is itself one of the best sources of information in regard to ethnic peculiarities. Since a play must be planned to appeal to the main body of the populace, we can use it to gain a clearer understanding of the likes and dislikes of the people as a whole; and a contrast of the drama of one literature with that of another often sheds light upon obscure questions. Two illustrations may be brought forward. Why is it that the masterpieces of the Spanish drama, so fertile in exciting plots, have not succeeded in gaining acceptance north of the Pyrenees? More than one English play and more than one French play is a favorite outside the borders of the language; but scarcely a single Spanish play has been taken up by the rest of the world. The reason would seem to be, that although the Spanish playwrights were the foremost in Europe so far as fertility and ingenuity went, their plays reflect so closely the characteristics which segregate the Spanish people from the rest of the inhabitants of Europe, that they seem to lack the element of the universal, which alone makes a work of art exportable. And why is it that the social dramas of Ibsen, profoundly as they have affected the content of later European drama, have never attained any lasting success in the theatres of Paris? One reason appears to be that Ibsen is inspired by a belief in individuality, and that therefore his plays are not really sympathetic to a people governed by the social instinct as the French have always been.

VII

Although no two peoples are alike in their beliefs and in their prejudices, and although the theatre may modify its aspect unceasingly, the prin-

ciples of the dramaturgic art are few and unchanging. And few also are the themes that lend themselves advantageously to the dramatist. Eckermann records Goethe's remark that he and Schiller were greatly interested in a saying of Gozzi's that there were only thirty-six possible dramatic situations and that Schiller had tried to make a list of them only to fail to find as many as the Italian fantasist had declared. A painstaking Frenchman, acting on this hint, has catalogued these thirty-six situations, with all their possible variations, and he has given under each a list of the chief plays in which it occurs. Without accepting the Frenchman's classification or the Italian's rigid limitation, we may admit that the number of effective situations is finite, and that they have all been used again and again by successive playwrights, each of whom handled the situations that appealed to him in accordance with the conditions of his own theatre and the desires of his own audience. A Greek trilogy, the *Oresteia*, has an obvious similarity to "Hamlet"—and the English tragedy has an obvious similarity to the "Aiglon" of M. Rostand; although there is little or no likeness discernible between the Greek plays and the French piece. A comparison of these three is instructive in that it compels us to observe differences of form. Other parallelisms might be adduced scarcely less striking than this.

"Hamlet," as has been noted already, was a reworking of an older piece belonging to the species of play known as the tragedy-of-blood,—a species which was very popular in the Elizabethan theatre and which served as a connecting link between the older and less dramatic chronicle-play and the true tragedy which was in time developed out of it as it had been developed out of the chronicle-play. Many another species has been evolved in the English drama during its five centuries of existence. There was the interlude, which prepared the way for a richer and later humorous drama. There was the comedy-of-humors, which Ben Jonson stamped with the impress of his vigorous personality and which is not without analogy to the forcibly comic passages of Dickens' novels. There is the so-called heroic-play, which even the genius of Dryden was powerless to establish. There was the sentimental-comedy founded by Steele and curiously paralleled by the *comédie-larmoyante* of La Chaussée.

In Greece there was the lyrical burlesque of Aristophanes. In Italy there was the comedy-of-masks, which Molière took for his early model. In Spain there was the cloak-and-sword play. In France again there was the *opéra-comique* of Scribe and there was later the *opéra-bouffe* of Meilhac and Halevy, both of them at once like and unlike the ballad-opera of Gay. In Germany there was the music-drama of Wagner, not without its resemblance to the tragedy of Sophocles. Each species has its personal charac-

teristics which distinguish it from every other kind of play; and each arose in consequence of certain tendencies in a certain place at a certain time. Unfortunately the historians of dramatic literature have not seen the necessity of tracing the evolution of these species. It is indeed a disadvantage to the student of the drama that the chief histories rarely provide a clear perspective of the development of this intricate art. The most of them are not really histories; they may be described not unfairly as collections of critical biographies of dramatists chronologically arranged.

In this essay attention has been concentrated upon the technic of the dramatist's art, because this is neglected unduly in most of the critical biographies of the dramatic poets, wherein we are likely to find abundant analysis of their poetic gifts and but little consideration of their dramaturgic skill. Shakespeare was a great poet, a profound moralist, a subtle psychologist; he was also a great playwright, master of play-making craftsmanship. There are books without end in which his imagination is belauded, his wit, his humor, his moral veracity, and in which there is little or no recognition of the fact that "Macbeth" and "As You Like It" were written not for us to read now leisurely in the study, but to be acted three hundred years ago on the stage. There is reason, no doubt, in attempting a philosophic interpretation of the moral aspects of these masterpieces; but there is likely to be misconception and misunderstanding if we allow ourselves to forget that however surpassing a genius Shakespeare was, none the less did he write these plays to provide his fellow-actors with congenial parts. He wrote them in conformity with the primitive conditions of the Elizabethan playhouse. He wrote them not only to express himself and to body forth his vision of our common humanity, but also to please the boisterous playgoers of those spacious days.

THE EARLIER MIRACLE PLAYS OF ENGLAND

CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY

I.—IN GENERAL.

IN the miracle plays of our forefathers the mirth, the proverbial philosophy, the social aims, the æsthetic and religious ideals of the Middle Ages still live for us. At first these plays existed as units, each commemorating some episode in the life of Christ or of the saints, or some important fragment of Old Testament history. But gradually they coalesced at this place and that into a cycle or sequence (of anywhere from five to fifty dramatic compositions), covering in one vast survey the whole of sacred history and prophecy, as told in scripture and in ecclesiastical legend, from the Fall of the Angels to the Day of Judgment. The cycle of York stands to one of its component pageants as the minster itself to chapel, cloister, nave or crypt. And the same simple, patient, practical mystics built both cycle and cathedral. If we would know how our fathers lived and dreamed we should study their temples of dramatic verse as well as their aspirations in stone.

In England the germs of these cycles are found, even before the Norman Conquest, in dramatic tropes or paraphrases of the sacred narrative, presented by the clergy in connection with the divine service. Later these efforts at histrionic, and therefore more vivid presentation of scriptural lessons, gradually lapsed from the Latin into the English tongue, from the church to the churchyard or the village green, and from the clerical to the lay actor—and they found in the process ever warmer welcome with the people of the town. During the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the trades unions of those days—the crafts or guilds of centres like Chester, York, Coventry, Wakefield, Dublin, Digby, Beverley and half a hundred more—adopted the cycles and presented them, each in its own way, but in their totality and in chronological sequence, in connection with the great festivals of the Christian year. For the day appointed, say that of *Corpus Christi*, each guild would have its own portion of the dramatic mystery to prepare. The guild not only regarded its particular play as a property or adjunct of the order, but delighted to improvise new scenes or passages and (in earlier days, at any rate) to stand the expense of the performance. One of the York registers shows that the first pageant of the cycle of *Corpus Christi* was acted by the Tanners. It was “God the Father making the heavens, angels and archangels, Lucifer and the angels

who fell with him into hell." The second pageant, "The creation of the world," was acted by the Plasterers; the third, "The making of Adam and Eve out of clay of the earth," by the Cardmakers; the fourth, "God forbidding Adam and Eve to eat of the tree of life," by the Fullers. And so on—fifty-one plays, closing with Doomsday, which was presented by the craft of Mercers. A certain humorous affinity of guild and play occasionally leaps to the eye, as when the Shipwrights devote themselves to the *Construction of the Ark*, the Fishmongers to *The Flood*, the Chandlers to the *Shepherds and the Star*, the Goldcrafts to the *Three Kings*, the Nailors and Sawyers to the *Massacre of the Innocents*, and the Barbers to the *Baptism of Jesus*. Each guild was wont to act on a wheeled platform or "pageant" scaffold; and the wagons bearing scenery and players made the circuit of the town, stopping for successive repetitions of the performance at duly appointed stations, where spectators in huge concourse stood or sat to be edified from dewy morn till eve. The celebration of the Craft Plays was a civic event; in their heyday the supreme social, æsthetic and theatrical amusement of our ancestors. And none the less so because originally devotional in character and intention.

When, after the reinstitution of the festival of *Corpus Christi* in 1311, the miracle plays began to be a function of the guilds, their secularization, even though the clerks still participated in the acting, was but a question of time; and the injection of crude comedy was a natural response to the civic demand. Indeed, if we consider comedy in its higher meaning as the play of the individual achieving his ends, not by revolt but by adjustment to circumstance and convention, the miracle play, as I have elsewhere said,¹ was in its essence a preparation for comedy rather than tragedy. For the theme of these dramas is, in a word, Christian: the career of the individual as an integral part of the social organism, of the religious whole. So also, their aim: the welfare of the social individual. They do not exist for the purpose of portraying immoderate self-assertion and the vengeance that rides after, but the beauty of holiness or the comfort of contrition. Herod, Judas and Antichrist are foils, not heroes. The hero of the miracle seals his salvation by accepting the spiritual ideal of the community. These plays contribute in a positive manner to the maintenance of the social organism. The tragedies of life and literature, on the other hand, proceed from secular histories, histories of personages liable to disasters because of excessive peculiarity,—of person or position. Tragedy is the drama of Cain, of the individual in opposition to the social, political, divine; its occasion is an upheaval of the social organism. The dramatic tone of the

¹ "Representative English Comedies," p. xxi.

miracle cycle is, therefore, determined by the conservative character of Christianity in general; the nature of the several plays is, however, modified by the relation of each to one or other of the supreme crises in the biblical history of God's ways toward man. The plays leading up to, and revolving about, the Nativity are of happy ending, and were doubtless regarded by authors and spectators, as we regard comedy. The murder of Abel, at first sombre, gradually passes into the comedy of the grotesque. The massacre of the innocents emphasizes not the weeping of a Rachel, but the joyous escape of the Virgin and the Child. In all such stories the horrible is kept in the background or used by way of suspense before the happy outcome, or frequently as material for mirth. Upon the sweet and joyous character of the pageants of Joseph and Mary and the Child we shall in due course dwell. They are of the very essence of comedy. Indeed, it must be said that in the old cycles the plays surrounding even the Crucifixion are not tragedy; they are specimens of the serious drama, of tragedy averted. The drama of the cross is a triumph. In no cycle does the *consummatum est* close the pageant of the Crucifixion; the actors announce, and the spectators believe, that this is "Goddiss Sone," whom within three days they shall again behold, though he has been "nayed on a tree unworthilye to die."

But though the dramatic edifice constructed by our mediæval forbears is comedy, it is also divine. And not for a moment did these builders lose their reverence for the House Spiritual that was sacred, nor once forget that the stones which they ignorantly and often mirthfully swung into strange juxtaposition were themselves hewn by Other Hands. The comic scenes of the English Miracle should, therefore, be regarded not as interruptions to the sacred drama, nor as independent episodes, but as counterpoint or dramatic relief. So, in the *Second Shepherd's Play*, one cannot but remark the propriety of the charm, as well as the dramatic effect, with which the foreground of the sheep-stealing fades into the radiant picture of the Nativity. The pastoral atmosphere is already shot with a prophetic gleam; the fulfilment is, therefore, no shock or contrast, but a transfiguration—an epiphany. It is, moreover, to be remembered that such characters and episodes as are comically treated are of secular derivation, or, if scriptural, of no sacred significance. Thus the comic and the realistic in the poet were set free; and it is just when he is embroidering the material of mystery with the stammel-red or russet of his homespun that he is of most interest to us. When the plays have passed into the hands of the guilds, the playwright puts himself most readily into sympathy with the literary consciousness as well as the untutored æsthetic taste of the public

if he colors the spectacle, old or new, with what is preëminently popular and distinctively national. In the minster and out of it, all through the Christian year, the townsfolk of York or Chester had as much of ritual, scriptural narrative and tragic mystery as they desired, and probably more. When the pageants were acted, they listened with simple credulity, no doubt, to the sacred history, and with a reverence that our age of illumination can neither emulate nor understand; but we may be sure that they awaited with keenest expectation those invented episodes where tradition conformed itself to familiar life—the impromptu sallies, the cloth-yard shafts of civic and domestic satire sped by well-known wags of town or guild. Of the appropriateness of these insertions the spectators made no question, and the dramatists themselves do not seem to have thought it necessary to apologize for their æsthetic creed or practice.

II.—THE CHURCH AND THE GUILDS

Mr. Leech, in his excellent contribution to the *Furnivall Miscellany* on English Plays and Players, says that from first to last, both at Lincoln and at Beverley, “the miracle plays were in the hands of the civic authorities and the craft guilds, assisted, of course, by the secular clergy, but with no mention of monks or regular canons,” and again that the origin of the English play must be sought in the same quarters, not “in country monasteries and among the religious, professionally so called.” To prove this, he relates, from a writer of about 1220, an interesting account of a contemporary representation of the Lord’s Resurrection and Ascension, which was given, *as usual*, by masked performers, not in the church but in the churchyard, “a customary institution, therefore, long before the foundation of the feast of *Corpus Christi* led to the concentration in one play of the various religious dramas already presented to the public.” Mr. Leech is probably right in concluding that, since there were no monks in Beverley or near it, this was not a monkish play. But this isolated instance of about 1230 does not prove, nor do Mr. Leech’s instances of municipal control from the middle of the next century, that the regular clergy, *i.e.*, monks and friars, had nothing to do with the origin of the English play; nor that the plays at Lincoln and Beverley were from first to last in the hands of the civic authorities, merely “assisted” by the secular clergy. These two towns do not stand for all England; and all that is proved is that, in these towns, as we already knew was the case in other towns, the guilds had control of the plays after the middle of the fourteenth century; and that as early as 1220 the Resurrection play, evidently of the kind ordinarily acted in the church, is acted in the churchyard for lack of room in the ecclesi-

astical edifice. It is reasonable to suppose that this play was written by the secular clergy, not the people, and that, if any assistance in acting was given at all, it was given by the people to the clergy, and not *vice versa*.

Of course, the popular development of the miracle plays was largely due to their representation *extra fores* at an early period in their career, and to the speedy coöperation of laymen and the gradual control by the municipality. But we cannot be at all sure that monks did not sometimes participate in the preparation of these plays. For, not to speak of the internal evidence of occasional ecclesiastical authorship, which may as probably have been monkish as not, we have at this day dramatic offices which were written and used by monks both before and after the conquest; we know that it was found necessary, according to the *Annales Burtonenses*, to forbid abbots and monks, as early as 1258, to witness plays (if the plays were profane, that is but a stronger indication of monastic fondness for the art); we know that a Carmelite friar called Robert Baston was a well-known playwright in 1314, and that one William Melton of the Friars Minors was, in 1426, most influential in the regulation of the *Corpus Christi* plays at York. The latter is denominated in the city registers "Professor *Paginae Sacrae*," which I would still persist in translating Professor of Holy Pageantry, although a critic of my "Historical Account of English Comedy"² asserts that the *Sacra Pagina* could not possibly have been anything but "Holy Writ." Considering that numerous manuscript pageants close with the words *Explicit Pagina*, one cannot readily abandon the surmise that Melton was one of those who from time to time (like Robert Croo of Coventry), revised, or perhaps even composed, *paginae* for the public. What contribution, if any, this eloquent preacher made to the York cycle we do not know; nor whether Baston contributed. He was of Scarborough, and a man of note, for he accompanied Edward II. on his expedition into Scotland; and it is recorded by Bale that he was the author not only of poems and rhymes, but of *Tragoediae et Comoediae Vulgares*. Though none of these are extant, I suspect with Collier that plays in the vulgar written by a friar would most probably be miracles. The story of Higden's authorship of the Chester plays is probably false. I am not so sure with regard to the attribution to Sir Thomas Francis, also a monk. But while we need not accept vague rumors of monkish authorship, accumulated evidence would certainly indicate its occasional existence. These considerations make me chary of eliminating monkish participation altogether; also of accepting the conjecture of municipal control "from first to last."

² *Athenaeum*, Aug. 1, 1903.

To the secular clergy is undoubtedly due most of the credit for popularizing the religious spectacles. The *Manuel de Pechiez* of the first half of the thirteenth century attributes not only the contrivance but the acting of miracles to "*les fous clers*," who performed them not only for purposes of devotion in the church, which was permissible, but, which was reprehensible, before crowds in public squares and church-yards; and Robert le Brunne, in his English version of the *Manuel* in 1303, holds up for like reprobation the acting of such sacred subjects "by clerks of the order" on the public ways and greens. It was a sacrilege to convert the mysteries of the passion properly represented in the church for purposes of devotion to material of amusement and unholy gain. From the beginning of the second quarter of the fourteenth century mention is still frequently made in contemporary literature of miracles as "*clerkes pleis*" and of clerks as actors in them. About this period, if not somewhat earlier, I have no doubt that the guilds were beginning to coöperate with the clergy in processional pageants and possibly in formal plays of the *Corpus Christi*, but as yet guilds had nothing like complete control. As late as 1378 we find a close religious corporation, that of the scholars and choristers of St. Paul's, resisting the encroachment of laymen upon their privilege of enacting Old Testament histories at Christmas time, and the corporation appears to have been successful.

Whether monks at any time had a hand in the inception or performance of these plays may remain an open question. We may be sure, however, that the craft plays as we have them are the result of collaboration through generations by the secular clergy of collegiate churches, parish clerks, town clergy, town clerks, secular clerks of the universities and grammar-school masters,³ also, without doubt, of the occasional guild playwright and the craftsman improviser. Such participation as the cloistered orders may have had is more than counter-balanced by the long-continued collaboration of the secular and the lay.

It must not be supposed, however, that after the industrial crafts had taken them up these miracles ceased to be cultivated by the clerical and semi-clerical orders, or to be acted in ecclesiastical precincts. The guild of which we first are informed that its functions were to cultivate processional and artistic as well as devotional and philanthropic ends was semi-clerical rather than secular. It is that of the Parish Clerks of London, incorporated by Henry III. about 1240. Of these clerks, Hone, in his *Ancient Mysteries*, says that they were under the patronage of St. Nicholas, and that it was an essential part of their profession not only to sing, but to

³ See Leech.

read, an accomplishment almost solely confined to the clergy; so that, on the whole, they seem to come under the denomination of a semi-religious fraternity. "It was anciently customary," Hone tells us, "for men and women of the first quality, ecclesiastics and others who were lovers of church music, to be admitted into this corporation, and they gave large gratuities for the support and education of many persons in the practice of that science. Their public feasts were frequent, and celebrated with song and music." According to Warton their profession, employment and character naturally dictated to this spiritual brotherhood the representation of plays, especially those of the spiritual kind. We do not know how early this semi-religious guild took to acting, but it is certain that in 1391 they had been playing cyclic miracles at Skinner's Well (Clerkenwell) for many years, since they enjoyed, at that time and place, the presence of the king, queen and nobles of the realm during a performance which was of great *éclat* and lasted for three days. In 1409, the Clerkenwell plays were still so popular that "most part of the nobility and gentry of England" attended during a dramatic cycle which lasted eight days. It is noteworthy that Stow, the historian, calls these interludes at Skinner's Well of 1391 an "example of later time," informing us that "of *old* time" the parish clerks of London were accustomed yearly to assemble at Clerkes' Well, near by, "and to play some large history of Holy Scripture." Since Clerkenwell is mentioned by Fitzstephen in his Description of London as a place frequented by scholars and youth, I think it practically certain that the sacred plays of which he elsewhere speaks as acted in London, between 1170 and 1182, were played then by these same parish clerks and at this same place.

As to the purely industrial guilds, we have earlier mention in England of their participation in secular than in religious processions and in the pageants that attended the same. "Triumphant shows," as Stow calls the "royal entries" into London and other great towns, consisted of processions in which some citizens rode and others presented "pageants and strange devices." Davidson, in his *English Mystery Plays*, argues that these pageants were, in England as in France, stationary, and so continued until the sixteenth century. But most of his examples are drawn from France. While the pageants in 1236 in London for Eleanor of Provence may have been stationary, those in 1293 for Edward I. were presented by the guild of fishmongers, moving through the streets. Of the pageants in 1377 for Richard II., some were progressive, others stationary. I see nothing to prove that such pageants were, in England, taken from the Bible story at an earlier date than 1430; though they may have been to some extent in France. As

to the dramatic quality of the shows, though they were at first, after the fashion of the French, *bas-reliefs* of living figures, they rapidly took on the braver qualities of the mumming and masking; and as to the mumming and masking, we know that they before long added to themselves speech and gesticulation like the regular drama. Lydgate, for instance, accompanied with verses the allegorical pageants for Mayings and royal entries in 1430 and after. It is largely because the guilds of the present city could not well afford to support religious plays as well as these expensive shows, that the London of those days did not contribute as much to the development of the religious drama as did the provinces.

The procession out of which grew most of the cyclic craft-plays was, as is well known, that of *Corpus Christi*. In this gorgeous religious parade both clergy and laity marched, and in the pageants representing the principal events in sacred history, they undoubtedly at first coöperated—a powerful means for the secularization of the scriptural drama. These pageants, falling more exclusively into the hands of the crafts, must have gained in importance so rapidly as to imperil the success of the procession itself. For we notice that in 1327 only sixteen years after the reinforcement of the *Corpus Christi* celebration by the Council of Vienna, there was founded in London a fraternity of *Corpus Christi* of the Skinners' Company, the express function of which was to foster the religious procession. Semi-religious guilds similar to that of the London Skinners are recorded as existing in Coventry, Cambridge and Leicester in 1348-9. It was not until 1426 that, in York, the pageants displayed by the industrial guilds or crafts were finally separated from the religious processions. That the semi-religious fraternities did not, however, confine themselves to processional activity appears from the history of the Parish Clerks of London. It is thought by some, indeed, that the *Ludus Filiorum Israel*, Cambridge, 1350, was acted by the *Corpus Christi* guild of that town, but I agree with Davidson and his authorities that it was more likely a school play. The next religious plays of which I have been able to find notice are the *Corpus Christi* cycles of Beverley, in 1377, and of York, in 1378, both acted by the crafts, and the *Paternoster Play* of York, in 1384, acted by a special fraternity; but at those dates the plays were evidently of longer standing. Though we cannot trust the traditional attribution of the Chester plays to 1268, it is probable, as I have elsewhere shown, that the popular presentation of them was in the hands of the guilds before 1352, and maybe as early as 1327. We must not imagine, however, that the church took its hand altogether off the plays. In many places the clergy of the collegiate church or cathedral continued to

coöperate as a guild; for instance, the Dean and Chapter of Lincoln Cathedral as late as 1483.⁴

III.—THE GROWTH OF THE CYCLES.

From the analogy of the English dramatic tropes and offices and the sacred plays of Hilarius, an Englishman brought up in France about the middle of the twelfth century, we may conclude that dramas, so long as acted in the church, were largely, if not wholly, in Latin. Gradually an Anglo-Norman line or refrain slipped in, even in case of a church play; and from the end of the fourteenth century on liturgical plays are performed which, with survivals of the Latin, are principally in English. Extra-ecclesiastical plays, on the other hand, were at an early period, probably first in the Anglo-Norman, and then in the English. If the traditional date of the Chester plays, 1268-1328, may be credited, we have an indication of the still earlier use of the vernacular in the miracle cycle.

Of extant approaches to a play in English, the earliest is *The Harrowing of Hell*, about 1250, which Dr. Ward well denominates a link between the dramatic dialogue and the religious drama. The next, according to Professor Ten Brink,⁵ is the *Jacob and Esau*, preserved as part of the Towneley cycle. Philological tests would indeed indicate for this an early date of composition. Ten Brink says about 1280, and he thinks it is an independent creation. I must agree with Mr. Pollard⁶ that, in style and language, it is more probably part of an original didactic cycle. The Brome play of *Abraham and Isaac*, which comes next in order of production, is undoubtedly the basis of *The Sacrifice of Isaac* in the Chester cycle, and probably in an earlier version dates from the beginning of the Fourteenth Century. The *Ludus Filiorum Israel*, which was performed at Cambridge, perhaps by the guild of *Corpus Christi*, in 1350, is not extant, but we may conjecture that it was akin to the play of the poltroon knight given by the English bishops at the Council of Constance, 1415, and embodied in the various cycles—best represented, however, by Parfre's *Kyllynge of the Children of Israell* in the Digby manuscript. These plays are all on subjects employed by the cycles. The *Harrowing* may be said to have contributed to drama, and therefore to comedy, an element of wonder; the two plays next mentioned contributed respectively elements of realism and pathos; the *Ludus Filiorum* in all likelihood some quality of farce or burlesque.

⁴ Leech, in "Furnivall Misc.," p. 225.

⁵ "Hist. Eng. Lit.," Vol. II., Pt. I., p. 244; Vol. II., Pt. II., p. 274.

⁶ "Towneley Plays," p. xxv.

The manuscript of the York plays appears to have been made 1430-1440; that of the Wakefield or so-called Towneley, after the middle of the same century. Most of the manuscript of the so-called Coventry plays was written in the year 1468. The manuscripts of the Chester cycle were made between 1591 and 1607, and appear to be based on a text of the beginning of the Fifteenth or the end of the Fourteenth Century. In spite of all that has been written, no agreement has yet been reached concerning the comparative age of the four great cycles. The modernity of the Chester manuscripts discourages dialectical investigation, but examination of the language of other cycles should be of assistance. The metrical tests have been only partly applied, as by Davidson and Hohlfeld. I know of no richer field for comparative study of sources, contents, vocabulary, verse and style than that which here remains to be explored.

According to the tradition preserved in the prose proclamation of the cycle for 1533, and copied in the manuscript of 1600, the Chester plays were "devised and made by one Sir Henry Francis" between 1268 and 1276. It is, however, the fashion nowadays to assign them to a much later date. Dr. Ward, for instance, hesitates to place them earlier than the beginning of the fifteenth or the end of the fourteenth century. The fact that French stanzas occur in five places points either to the use of an original written in French, or to composition in a period before the French had ceased to be the language considered appropriate for kings and courtiers. If the latter hypothesis holds, Dr. Ward is of opinion that the passages in French must have been written before the reign of Richard II. If, on the other hand, the plays are based upon a French original, it has been shown by Professor Hohlfeld to be not at all likely that they should be produced after other mediæval English cycles had developed themselves independently of foreign models.⁷ In either case I am persuaded that these passages, and in general the plays containing them, were written at as early a period as the older plays of the York cycle. Pollard⁸ dates the composition of the Chester plays 1340-1350. So, also, Ten Brink. The liturgical quality of certain parts and the undramatic and almost epical quality of others; the general prevalence of the didactic, the concatenation in one play of scriptural or legendary actions sufficient for several pageants, the general crudity of technique, are a few of the numerous considerations that may

⁷ The plays which undoubtedly show French affinities are VI, VIII, XI, XVI, XVII, XIX; but, as Hohlfeld (*Die altenglischen Kollektivmysterien*, Anglis, vol. xi) has pointed out, the parts of VIII, XI, XIX written in the Chaucerian stanza are probably additions by the writer of the Prologue of 1600. Professor Davidson's suggestion (*English Mystery Plays*, p 130 of an Anglo-Norman origin does not alter the presumption of antiquity.

⁸ *Engl. Miracle Plays*, XXXVI.

be adduced to support as early a date for some of the plays. I am, indeed, of the opinion that there is, in spite of apparent anachronism and evident contradiction, a *souçon* of truth in one or other of the traditions concerning the still earlier origin of the cycle. The manuscript prepared by James Miller in 1607⁹ has notes on a fly-leaf, perhaps of later date, which attempt to reconcile both of the earlier accounts. First, it attributes the authorship of the plays to "Randle Higgenet, a Member of Chester Abbey," who also secured license from Rome to have them played in the English tongue. Now, this account is derived from the same source, whatever that was, as that of the *Banes* in verse prefixed by George Bellin to his manuscript of the plays, of 1600,¹⁰ and that of the *Notes on the Chester Plays*¹¹ prepared somewhere before 1595 by Archdeacon Rogers and written out by his son in 1609. But this source cannot have been authentic, because both the *Banes* and the Archdeacon's *Notes* fix Higgenet's authorship during the mayoralty of Sir John Arneway, and the *Notes*, which are the earlier of the two, assign that period to 1328-9, which might indeed correspond with Higgenet, whether or not he be the celebrated Ralph Higden, a monk in Chester Abbey from 1299 to 1363, but cannot suit Arneway's term of office, which ended in 1276. The MS. of 1607 proceeds, in the second place, to assign to one Sir Henry Francis, sometime a monk of the monastery of Chester, the credit of having obtained from "Pope Clemens a thousand daies of pardon, etc., . . . for those who resorted peaceably to see the plays." This attempt to reconcile the claims of Francis with those of Higgenet is inspired by the prose proclamation for the Whitsun Plays of 1533, included by Bellin in his MS. of 1600, according to which the authorship as well as the defense of the plays is attributed to Francis. The proclamation of 1533, moreover, does not mention Higgenet. Nor does it misdate Arneway. It fixes the date of composition by the papal reign of a Clement and the mayoralty of Arneway. Since Clement IV. was Pope from 1265 to 1276, and Arneway mayor from 1268 to 1276, this account has at any rate the merit of consistency.¹² This conclusion is confirmed by

⁹ Br. Mus. Harl. MS. 2124. For a scholarly discussion of the MSS. of the Ch. Plays, see Dr. Deimling's introduction to his E. E. T. S. edition.

¹⁰ Harl. MS. 2013.

¹¹ Harl. MS. 1944 in Furnivall's *Digby Plays*, XVIII.

¹² Mr. Leech (*Furnivall Misc.*, p. 232) objects to the authority of the proclamation of 1533, as reported in Bellin's MS., that it speaks of the monastery of Chester as "since dissolved," whereas that monastery was not dissolved till 1540. But the "since dissolved" is merely an incorrect insertion, or gloss, by Bellin writing in 1600. It does not vitiate the trustworthiness of the proclamation. Indeed, it is to be noted that in the account of Francis and the monastery, based upon the same proclamation, in Miller's MS. of the plays, 1607, no mention is made of the dissolution of the monastery.

Dr. Ungemach's inquiry into the sources of the first five Chester plays,¹³ from which it appears that the portions, not only of the Chester, but of the Coventry cycle, which are derived from Old Testament subjects, were borrowed from originals of earlier date and currency than those used by the York and Wakefield cycles, and that a much larger proportion of this part of the Chester plays than was known to Collier, etc., goes back to these sources. Since the originals in question were available at successive periods from the end of the twelfth to the middle of the fourteenth century, it is not impossible that as early as 1276 some portion of the Chester Plays derived from them may have been in existence. If the plays were not originally devised as early as 1267-1276, it is not improbable that they were in existence in 1328-1329, the date assigned by Rogers. If there is any truth whatever in the tradition, the Pope who granted pardon to those resorting to see them must have been either Clement IV., 1265-1276, or Clement V., 1305-1316, or Clement VI., 1342-1352. Taking all indications into account, there is, therefore, good reason to believe that at the latest some of the Chester plays were in existence during the first half of the fourteenth century, and that the present form of the cycle, with its marks of occasional dependence upon other cycles,¹⁴ represents, in general, a revision which may have been made about the end of the fourteenth or the beginning of the fifteenth century.

The York cycle, according to its scholarly editor,¹⁵ was composed between 1340 and 1530. The Wakefield (Towneley) plays, says Mr. Pollard in his introduction to the latest edition,¹⁶ are built in at least three distinct stages, covering a period of which the limits were perhaps 1360 and 1410. The portions belonging to the earliest stage (part or whole of ten plays),¹⁷ written in the metrical romance stanza ridiculed by Chaucer in the *Rime of Sir Thopas*, would appear to him to have been written as early as 1360. Their primitive character and the fact that they are entirely independent of the corresponding portions of the York cycle, may indeed

¹³ *Die Quellen d. fünf ersten Chester Plays*, pp. 14, 16 193-198, etc.

¹⁴ *The Play of the Shepherds*, Chester VII, resembles Wakefield's *Prima Pastorum* XII; *Christ in the Temple*, Chester XI, may be from York XX (not by way of W., as Hohlfield, p. 264, thinks). The speech of Jesus in *Resur*, Chester XIX, is akin to W. XXVI, XXXVIII, etc. In my opinion, however, it does not derive from that, but from an earlier version of the missing portion in York XXXVIII or from a common original in the primitive *ab ab ab ab* stanza which is the stanza of York VIII and the body of the oldest York verse-forms. Personal examination convinces me that the Chester play on *The Sacrifice of Isaac* is borrowed almost literally from the *Brome Play* on the same subject; not from any independent English or French, the original of both. Hohlfield, who is of the same opinion, conjectures an earlier version of the *Brome Play*, beginning of the 14th century, as the basis of Chester.

¹⁵ Lucy Toulmin Smith, *York Mystery Plays*, Oxford, 1885.

¹⁶ By Geo. England, E. E. T. S., Extra Series LXXI.

¹⁷ I, IV, V, VII, IX, XI and parts of X, XVII, XXIII, X, XVIII.

indicate a period of composition as early as 1340-1350. This original didactic cycle, as Mr. Pollard calls it, was supplemented in the succeeding period by influences from York. During this stage the playwrights of Wakefield¹⁸ borrow from the York cycle five plays, and adapt three.¹⁹

In the third stage, the hand of a genius is evident. That his contributions were only slightly later than those of the second stage would appear, not only from internal evidence (metrical and linguistic), but from a variety of historical considerations. To the allusions concerning dress cited by the Surtees editor, which would indicate a date between 1390 and 1420, Mr. Pollard adds confirmatory material. He thinks, however, and with reason, that "in a writer so full of allusions, the absence of any reference to fighting tends to show that the plays were not written during the war with France, and thus everything seems to point to the reign of Henry IV as the most likely date of their composition. The date of our text is probably about half a century later. But the example of the York plays shows us that in its own habitat the text of the play could be preserved in tolerable purity for a longer period than this. In the direction of popular treatment, it was impossible for any editor, however much disposed towards tinkering, to think that he could improve on the playwright of the nine-line stanza (in which are written the best portions of the Wakefield cycle), while it is reasonable to suppose that the hold of these plays on the Yorkshire audience was sufficiently strong to resist the intrusion of didactics." To these considerations I would add that the Herod's ironical and easy disposal of the Papal Chair in Wakefield XVI. is eminently appropriate to the period of *Præmunire*, 1392, and that the shepherd's complaint of "gentlerymen" in the *Secunda*, fits very well the decades on either side of Wat Tyler's rebellion.

The temptation is great to assign the so-called Coventry cycle (N-Town or Hegge Plays) to strolling players and East Midland origin, for the guilds of Coventry had their own miracle plays, two of which are still extant; but we have not yet sufficient data for discrediting the statement of Dr. James, made about 1630, that the cycle was dramatized and acted by monks or mendicant friars and was commonly called *Ludus Coventriae*.

¹⁸ I have no room to discuss objections against the Wakefield origin of these plays. The only definite evidences the appearance of "Wakefield" and "Berkers" at the head of the first pageant, "Wakefield" at the head of the third, these references to crafts as playing, are for Wakefield. There is no authority for Woodkirk or Widkirk, or Nostel or Whalley. The topographical allusions are suitable to Wakefield. That Wakefield players sometimes assisted in the York Plays to which the Towneley MS. is deeply indebted is well known (see Miss L. T. Smith's *York Plays*, XXXVIII).

¹⁹ Borrowed—VIII, XVIII, XXV, XXVI, XXX. Adapted—X, XIV, XV. Still others, like IV, XIX, XXVII, would seem to be based upon alternatives of Y. plays.

Whether the authors were the Grey Friars of Coventry, as Mr. Sharp, in his *Dissertation* (of 1816) *on the Coventry Mysteries*, holds, is another and subordinate question. Dr. James does not say so. I prefer the mendicant friars. Nor does Dr. James say that the book is correctly called the *Ludus Coventriae*. He is careful to say that it is commonly or traditionally so called "*vulgo*," and he adds the alternative, self-evident title *Ludus Corporis Christi*. It is not impossible, therefore, that he deemed this appellation the safer under which to catalogue them. So far as I can discover, all the numerous contemporary notices of the acting of plays at Coventry often but vaguely cited in favor of participation by the Grey Friars, refer to those presented, not by friars, but by guilds. Mr. Sharp, indeed, avers that it was the Grey Friars who performed the *Corpus Christi* play for Henry VII., 1492; but he gives no authority. If he drew his information from Dugdale's²⁰ *History of Warwickshire*, as seems probable, he should have noticed that there is nothing there to show that this was not the only occasion upon which the Grey Friars acted. Since there is no authentic proof that they participated in any of the other performances known to have been given between 1416 and 1591, we cannot with any certainty connect them with this N-Town cycle. And since other miracle plays acted by the guilds in Coventry,²¹ duplicating some of the N-Town plays, but with independent treatment, still exist, we must attribute to these guild plays the authenticated dates of performance ordinarily assigned to the N-Town cycle, viz., 1392-1591, unless the N-Town cycle, as has been conjectured (by Ulrici and Klein), but without sufficient basis, is in part or whole identical with the Coventry guild cycle. Halliwell-Phillipps says that the dialect is of that part of the country in which Coventry is situated, but Professor Ten Brink attributes the dialect and scribal peculiarities rather to the northeast midlands. Mr. Pollard adds good reasons for the latter conclusion, and assigns the composition of the cycle to the beginning of the fifteenth century.²²

For our purpose, however, it is sufficient to note that the plays were intended to be given, probably were given, at other places than Coventry, and that, as Dr. Ward has said, their ecclesiastical flavor indicates the influence of ecclesiastical minds. Professor Hohlfeld, indeed, shows that in

²⁰ Collier II, 74.

²¹ The Shearman and Taylors' *Pageants* from the *Annunciation* to the *Flight into Egypt* (Ms., 1533), and the Weavers' Pageant of *The Presentation in the Temple*.

²² Pollard *English Miracle Plays*, XXXVIII, ten Brink, *Gesch. d. alt-engl. Litt.*, §275. In calling attention to the indebtedness of the Co. *Resurrection* to the East Midland *Harrowing of Hell*, Mr. Pollard accidentally cites "erthly man, that I have wrought," which, however, occurs, not in Co., but in Ch. and T. He, of course, intended to quote "Harde gatys have I gon."

certain plays the Coventry bears a closer relation than any other cycle to the liturgical drama. While, then, their composition may, in general, be assigned to the first half of the fifteenth century, some parts of the cycle appear to be of much earlier date. Hohlfeld says that, like the York plays, this cycle shows no signs of borrowing from other cycles. That, however, is more than doubtful. The manuscript being comparatively modern, the cycle displays frequent elaborations of a more recent date than any in the York and the Wakefield. I have detected resemblances to the Chester and, in occasional phrases and lines, to the York, which can hardly be explained otherwise than as derivative.

This preliminary survey justifies us in regarding the portions of the Chester and Coventry cycles which are derived from the Old Testament as, in general, of prior date to the rest of those cycles and to York and Towneley. But the rest of the Coventry should be assigned to a date later than that of the other cycles.

Of two other cycles, the Cornish and the Digby, it is not necessary to say further at present than that the composition of the former in the Cymric has been placed somewhat earlier than 1300, and that the date and quality of the Digby plays and other fragments of late cycles will be discussed in due course.

IV.—THE DRAMATIC QUALITY OF THE OLDER CYCLES: THE CORNISH AND THE OLD TESTAMENT CHESTER AND COVENTRY.

It was said above that the miracle plays were a propædæutic to comedy rather than to tragedy. So far as the direct effect upon the comedy of Heywood, Greene and Shakespeare is concerned, it may appear to some of no particular importance in what order the cycles in general were composed or the plays within the cycles. But, as I have elsewhere attempted to show²³ the Tudor dramatists did not make their art; they worked with what they found, and they found a dramatic medium of expression to which centuries and countless influences had contributed. An extended study of the beginnings of English comedy should determine, so far as possible, the relative priority, not only of cycles, but of the comic passages within the cycles; what each composition has contributed to the enfranchisement of the comic spirit and the development of the technical factors of the art,—to what extent each has expressed or modified the realistic, satirical romantic or humorous view of life, and in what ways each has reflected the temper of its time, the manners and the mind of the people that wrote, acted and witnessed these early dramas. If I arrange the plays that bear upon

²³ Rep. Engl. Com., p. 24.

the development of comedy according to my conclusions regarding priority of composition, the order, broadly stated for our present rapid survey, would seem to be: First, the Cornish and the Old Testament portions of the Chester and Coventry, then the productions of the second and third periods of the York, and closely following these the crowning efforts of the Wakefield or Towneley, then the New Testament plays of the Chester and Coventry, and finally the surviving portions of the cycles of Digby and Newcastle. This order, which is roughly historical, has the advantage, as I perceive after testing it, of presenting a not unnatural sequence of the æsthetic values or interests essential to comedy; first, as a full discussion would reveal, the humor of the incidental, then of the essential or real, and gradually of the satirical in something like their order of appearance within the cycles; afterwards the accession of the romantic, the wonderful, the allegorical, the mock-ideal, and finally the scenic and sensational.

Of the Old Testament, that is, the earlier Chester and Coventry plays, the most useful for our present purpose are *The Death of Abel* and *Noah's Flood*. With them may be considered the Cornish version, though, as I have said, that cycle in general is destitute of humor. The Cornish miracles present us with dramatic situations in the liturgical-epical germ, and characters in the undifferentiated "rough." The *Cain*, for instance, is but boor and niggard; his possibilities for comedy are undeveloped, but it is impossible that they should long be repressed. The devils, indeed, who come forward like a chorus at the end of each important scene, were probably pressed into the service of merriment; but the dramatic motive for which they exist is serious, and the part assigned to them is more consistent than in any of the other cycles. The Chester play of *Cain*, a conglomerate running from the Creation to the death of Abel, is not only one of the crudest of the cycle (much more so, for instance, than the sacrifice of Isaac based upon the Brome Play), but one of the most naïve on the subject. The character of the potential fratricide, with his canny offering of the earless corn that grew next the way, and his defiant "God, thou gotteste noe better of me, Be thou never so gryme," is manifestly nearer the primitive conception than the Cayme of York or Wakefield. He is not yet wit, wag and dare-devil. The episode in the Chester is didactic, but still realistic; less imaginative than in the York or Wakefield, but creative. Evidently more modern than the Chester play, which it somewhat resembles, is the *Cain and Abel* of the Coventry. The villain is well-conceived, and elaborated with pith and humor. He discusses the Almighty with a worldly wisdom that remotely approaches that of the Wakefield, and he expresses his opinion of Abel "Amonges alle ffolys that gon on grownd,

I hold that thou be one of the most, to tythe the best that is most sownde. And kepe the werst that is nere lost," with somewhat the same vivid and natural use of the vernacular. The action between the brothers is more elaborate than in Chester, but the dramatic quality depends rather upon dialogue than development of the situation. Its versification is certainly not that of the earliest stage of the cycle to which it belongs, and its lyrical quality might even indicate a later period of composition than the corresponding plays in the York and Wakefield; but it is not derived from either of them.

The development of a situation from the serious to the humorous is admirably illustrated by still another play of this earlier group. In the dramatization of the Flood, the Cornish cycle presents the serious aspect of the naïve conception. Noah and his wife are on affectionate terms; she is obedient and helpful. It has not occurred to the writer to introduce an extraneous interest, as, for instance, that of conjugal strife. The play is interesting, however, because it displays some slight ability to discriminate characters. Likewise unconscious of comic possibilities is the Coventry play of the Flood. Though probably of later composition than the corresponding plays in other cycles, it is, in its greater part, one of the earlier, though not of the earliest plays of its own cycle. The character (the sons' wives now begin to play a part), pious, prosaic, and uninteresting, are perfunctorily portrayed, but the construction of the play is ingenious, especially in its manipulation of the episode of Lamech, not as an extraneous action, but as a factor in the organic development of the motive; a hint of a sub-plot. In the Chester play, on the other hand, the characters are distinct and consistently developed. The comic episodes are natural and justifiable, for they serve to display, not to distort, character, and they grow out of the dramatic action. They are, moreover, varied, and, to some extent, cumulative. This play is indeed a vast dramatic advance upon the Coventry. It is approximately on the same plane of dramatic development as the York play of *The Flood*, and should be considered with reference to it, although in spite of one or two unique resemblances in language and conception,²⁴ neither pageant can be regarded as dependent upon the other.

It is noteworthy that the York play on the building of the Ark, one of the earliest of that cycle, is serious. The play on the Flood, however, which is in a somewhat later stanza, indulges in an altercation between Noah and his wife. The humor of this in turn is surpassed by that of the

²⁴ Y. VIII, 41; Ch. III, 41. Uxor wishes to rescue her commodrys, etc.; appearance of the rainbow.

Chester, so also the technique. While in the York the amusing episode is sudden and of one sequence, in the Chester the clouds upon the domestic horizon gather with artistic reluctance, and, when they burst, refresh the soil in more than one spot. Noah is not yet the hen-pecked husband of later comedy, though prophetic thereof. Peaceably inclined, but capable of a temper, he serves God and apostrophizes the perversity of women. The possibilities of his wife's character are cunningly unfolded. At first apparently amenable to reason, her progress toward "curstness" is a study in the development of character. Few situations in our early drama are better conceived than her refusal at the critical moment to enter the Ark unless her gossips are also taken aboard. Cain's "Shall we *all* feche her in?", the drinking sing,—a rollicking song, too, with the lilt, "Back and side, go bare, go bare,"—Noah's collapse of temper and the *alapam auri*, all these are good fooling, and must have left our ancestors thirsty for more. The "business" is of course enhanced by the multiplication of participants, by the solicitude of the children and the apathy of the gossips. The song, I am afraid, is a later addition; but even without that the appropriateness of diction to the naïve (not vague or poetic) statement of details marks an essential advance in realism.

V.—THE QUALITY OF THE YORK CYCLE

The York cycle affords very few situations which may be denominated comic. Such as are of that character must be assigned to more than one period of composition; none, however, is to be found in the plays which according to philological tests belong to the formative stage of the cycle.²⁵ This is but usual, for while the pageants were illustrating only the more important events of the church calendar, and were still reminiscent of their ecclesiastical origin, opportunity for ludicrous situations was limited; we find a touch of nature here and there perhaps; but not more.

All approaches to the comic in the plays of York—the abusive behavior of Cain, the quarrel between Noah and his wife, the attempt of the shepherds to mimic the angelic choir, the beadle's intrusion upon the loves of Pilate and Percula, the effort of Herod and his sons "to have gaudis full goode and games or we go" with the prisoner brought to trial, and the failure of their bluster, threats, and shouting, to "gete one worde" out of him,—may be safely attributed to schools, or periods, of composition which we shall style the middle and the later. A comparative study of the

²⁵ Probably II, X, XI, XX, XXIII, XXIV, XXVII, XXXV, XXXVII, and those parts of XII, XV, and XVII which also show connections with the typical northern septenar stanza. (Davidson *Engl. Myst. Plays*, p. 144, would also add IX, second part of Noah, I do not agree).

versification, phraseology and occasion of these passages leads me, moreover, to the conclusion that the original comic parts of the *Sacrificium of Cayme and Abell*,²⁶ of the *Noe and His Wife*, and of the *Shepherds*, are of a school or master of somewhat earlier date than the portions dealing with the Beadle and Herod: a school or master of what we may call the middle or humorous period.

The Beadle and Herod episodes, on the other hand, are realistic. They occur in "*The Dream of Pilate's Wife*" and "*The Trial Before Herod*"—plays which themselves form the core of a group of six that in literary style, conversational method, dramatic action and technique, might very well be the work of one individual. The subjects²⁷ are such as might reasonably have been used for an expansion of the cycle to accommodate the increasing number of guilds in York, at a time after the more important and obvious religious events had been dramatized. The materials are practically the same for these six plays, and are subjected in each case to the same free handling.²⁸ The same somewhat alliterative, experimental tendency of versification marks them all. Not only are the experimental or transitional stanzaic forms of this group of plays, the excessive alliteration, the substitution of anapaestic ease and rapidity for the regular beat and stiffer movement, indications of a later date, but the style of these plays is that of a different author, or school, which retained the facile idiom of the earlier days, but substituted for the old-fashioned humor an attempt at realistic portrayal of life, and for the home-spun wit a bombast and abuse which, though idiomatic, are sometimes wearisome. In addition to the bombastic language of Pilate and Herod, realistic touches and other advances in dramatic technique leap to the eye in the conduct of Caiaphas and Anna, their cunning, their virulence, their knowledge of the shady side of contract law; in the careful portraiture of Judas, who "wolde make a merchaundyse with the high priests their myscheffe to marre"; in his shifts for gain, his remorse when the triumph gutters; in the grim humor of the Janitor (the precursor of Shakespeare's Porter of hell-gate), when Judas

²⁶ The Brewbarret passage as it stands is later, but it probably represents the earlier Garcio who was the origin of the Wakefield Pikeharness.

²⁷ XXVI, *The Conspiracy to Take Jesus*; XXVIII, *The Agony and Portrayal*; XXIX, *Peter's Denial*; *Jesus before Caiaphas*; XXX, *Pilate's Wife*, etc.; XXXI, *Herod*; XXXIII, *Second Trial Before Pilate Continued*, and probably XXXII, *Purchase of the Field of Blood*. Perhaps this playwright also rewrote XXXIV. I think he remodeled XXXV, *Crucifixion*, and XXXVI, *Mortificatio Christi* in the old metres. While there are good metrical reasons for doubting whether these plays dealing with the Magi and the Innocents are by the same hand, there are indications throughout of the influence of the realistic master or school.

²⁸ See Kamann, *Die Quellen d. York Plays*, Anglia X, 210, U.S.W., and Herttrich, *Studien zu d. York Plays*, Breslau, 1886.

applies for admission, "Thy glyfftyng is so grimly thou gars my harte growe," . . . "thou lokist like a lurdane his liffelod hadde lost," and his description of the traitor to the "Dukes":

"A hyne helte-full of ire, for hasty he is . . .
I kenne hym noght, but he is cladde in a cope
He cares with a kene face uncomely to kys";—

in the common sense of the Beadle in *The Dream* who, knowing literally the laws, would send the lady home, ere "the day waxe ought dymme,"

"For scho may stakir in the strete,
But scho stalworthely stande;
Late hir take hir leve while that light is";

in the curtain side of Pilate and his lady; in the discriminate drawing of women from Percula and her maid down to the Mulier who detects and taunts Peter with falsehood:

"Itt were grete skorne that he schulde skape, . . .
Wayte nowe, he lokis like a brokke,
Were he in a bande for to bayte;
Or ellis like a nowele in a stok,
Full prevaly his pray for to wayte",

and Peter's plea that her accusation be rejected,—

"For women are crabbed, that comes them of kynde";

in the vivid brutality of the soldiers, the minute and horrible detail of their conversation, the quick retort and apt, the picturesque phrase, the elaborate dramatic dialogue, sometimes long-winded, to be sure; in the unconscious but skilful distinction between characters somewhat similar, Caiaphas, Annas, Pilate, Herod, and the realistic introduction of supernumeraries; in the interplay of the pathetic, the wonderful, and the fearful, to awaken dramatic interest, the accumulation of scenes within the act, and the frequent use of dramatic surprise. These and other features of the kind characterize the York school of realism. So peculiar and at the same time uniform is the technique that its presence may be detected in plays not characterized by the transitional and vitiated verse structure of the group, but written in an earlier ecclesiastical stanza, and even at times in plays marked by the typical twelve-line septenar stanza of the parent cycle. Wherever the York realist has inserted, elaborated, revised, or recast,²⁹ he

²⁹ For instance, certain overalliterated and accented Herodiams and other regalities in X., XVI., XVII.

has left his unquestionable mark, though side by side with passages just as undoubtedly of earlier date.

Indeed, the longer one studies these York plays, the more is one persuaded that not only were there two York periods or schools, but that there was at least one playwright in each who distinctly contributed to the development of English drama. The playwright or playwrights of the middle period, to which belong *Caym*, *Noe and His Wife* and *The Angels and Shepherds*, are characterized by an unsophisticated humor; the distinctive playwright of the later or realistic period, is marked by his observation of life, his reproduction of manners, his dialogue, and the plasticity of his technique.

That the later school or period was influenced by the manner of its predecessor, is further indicated by the fact that of its two most efficient stanzaic forms, one, namely, that used in *The Conspiracy*, is anticipated (though in simpler iambic beat) by that of *Noe*, the typical play of the middle period, the school of humors, while the other, the stanzaic form, of which variants are found in *The Mortificacio* and *The Second Trial*, has its germ probably in *The Cayme* of that same middle period.

The rhyme-scheme of the *Noe* is a b a b a b a b⁴ c³ d³c⁴ c⁴ c⁴ d³ in iambs varied with anapaests, thus:

Filius. Fadir, I have done nowe as ye comaunde,
My modir comes to you this daye.

Noe. S'cho is welcome, I wele warrande,
This worlde sall sone be waste awaye.

Uxor. Where art thou, Noye.

Noe. Loo! here at hande,
Come hedir faste, dame, I thee praye.

Uxor. Trowes thou that I wol leve the harde lande
And tourne up here on toure deraye?

Nay, Noye, I am nought bowne
To fonde nowe over there ffelis,
Doo barnes, goo we and trusse to towne.

Noe. Nay, certis, sothly than mon ye drowne.

Uxor. In faythe, thou were als goode come downe,
And go do som what ellis.

The rhyme-scheme of *The Conspiracy* of the Realistic school is the same; but the octave is in septenars, and the triplet c c c is in trimeters.

The rhyme-scheme of the other perfected stanza of the realistic York school, as seen in the *Mortificacio*, a b a b b c b c³ d¹ e e² d³, is merely an

expansion of that of the *Caym* of the earlier school, which runs thus, in iambs, a b a b b c⁴ d¹ b c c⁴ d² :

Caym. Me! Whythir now in wilde waulaud,
 Trowes thou I thynke to trusse of towne?
 Goo, jape thee, robard jangillande,
 Me liste nought nowe to rouk nor rowne.

Abell. A! dere brothir, late us be bowne
 Goddis biddying blithe to fulfille,
 I tell thee.

Caym. Ya, daunce in the devilway, dresse thee downe,
 For I wille wyrke even as I will.
 What mystris thee, in gode or ille,
 Of me to melle thee.

The Mortificacio makes a quatrain out of the first b c, rhymes the triplet and slides into anapaests; and so doing prepares not only the best stanzaic instrument of the York realistic school, but at the same time the prototype of the brightest, wittiest, and most effective verse-form of the finest plays of the neighboring town of Wakefield.

With these two stanzaic forms the realistic school, so far as we may conclude from the mutilated condition of surviving plays, seems to experiment; and the second of them, that of the *Mortificacio*, may be regarded as the final and distinctive outcome of York versification. To the leading playwrights of each of these schools, the former the best humorist, the latter the best realist of the York drama,—to these anonymous composers of the most facile and vivid portions of the York cycle, our comedy owes a still further debt; for from them it would appear that a poet of undoubted genius derived something of his inspiration and much of his method and technique,—our first great comic dramatist, the anonymous *Player-Clerk* of Wakefield.

FASHION

GEORG SIMMEL

THE general formula in accordance with which we usually interpret the differing aspects of the individual as well as of the public mind may be stated broadly as follows: We recognize two antagonistic forces, tendencies, or characteristics, either of which, if left unaffected, would approach infinity; and it is by the mutual limitation of the two forces that the characteristics of the individual and public mind result. We are constantly seeking ultimate forces, fundamental aspirations, some one of which controls our entire conduct. But in no case do we find any single force attaining a perfectly independent expression, and we are thus obliged to separate a majority of the factors and determine the relative extent to which each shall have representation. To do this we must establish the degree of limitation exercised by the counteraction of some other force, as well as the influence exerted by the latter upon the primitive force.

Man has ever had a dualistic nature. This fact, however, has had but little effect on the uniformity of his conduct, and this uniformity is usually the result of a number of elements. An action that results from less than a majority of fundamental forces would appear barren and empty. Over an old Flemish house there stands the mystical inscription, "There is more within me"; and this is the formula according to which the first impression of an action is supplemented by a far-reaching diversity of causes. Human life cannot hope to develop a wealth of inexhaustible possibilities until we come to recognize in every moment and content of existence a pair of forces, each one of which, in striving to go beyond the initial point, has resolved the infinity of the other by mutual impingement into mere tension and desire. While the explanation of some aspects of the soul as the result of the action of two fundamental forces satisfies the theoretical instinct, it furthermore adds a new charm to the image of things, not only by tracing distinctly the outlines of the fact, but also by interpreting the vague, often enigmatic, realization that in the creation of the life of the soul deeper forces, more unsolved tensions, more comprehensive conflicts and conciliations have been at work than their immediate reality would lead one to suppose.

There seem to be two tendencies in the individual soul as well as in society. All designations for this most general form of dualism within us undoubtedly emanate from a more or less individual example. This funda-

mental form of life cannot be reached by exact definition; we must rest content with the separation of this primitive form from a multitude of examples, which more or less clearly reveal the really inexpressible element of this duality of our soul. The physiological basis of our being gives the first hint, for we discover that human nature requires motion and repose, receptiveness and productivity—a masculine and a feminine principle are united in every human being. This type of duality applied to our spiritual nature causes the latter to be guided by the striving towards generalization on the one hand, and on the other by the desire to describe the single, special element. Thus generalization gives rest to the soul, whereas specialization permits it to move from example to example; and the same is true in the world of feeling. On the one hand we seek peaceful surrender to men and things, on the other an energetic activity with respect to both.

The whole history of society is reflected in the striking conflicts, the compromises, slowly won and quickly lost, between socialistic adaptation to society and individual departure from its demands. We have here the provincial forms, as it were, of those great antagonistic forces which represent the foundations of our individual destiny, and in which our outer as well as our inner life, our intellectual as well as our spiritual being, find the poles of their oscillations. Whether these forces be expressed philosophically in the contrast between cosmotheism and the doctrine of inherent differentiation and separate existence of every cosmic element, or whether they be found in practical conflict representing socialism on the one hand or individualism on the other, we have always to deal with the same fundamental form of duality which is manifested biologically in the contrast between heredity and variation. Of these the former represents the idea of generalization, of uniformity, of inactive similarity of the forms and contents of life; the latter stands for motion, for differentiation of separate elements, producing the restless changing of an individual life. The essential forms of life in the history of our race invariably show the effectiveness of the two antagonistic principles. Each in its sphere attempts to combine the interest in duration, unity, and similarity with that in change, specialization, and peculiarity. It becomes self-evident that there is no institution, no law, no estate of life, which can uniformly satisfy the full demands of the two opposing principles. The only realization of this condition possible for humanity finds expression in constantly changing approximations, in ever retracted attempts and ever revived hopes. It is this that constitutes the whole wealth of our development, the whole incentive to advancement, the possibility of grasping a vast proportion of

all the infinite combinations of the elements of human character, a proportion that is approaching the unlimited itself.

Within the social embodiments of these contrasts, one side is generally maintained by the psychological tendency towards imitation. The charm of imitation in the first place is to be found in the fact that it makes possible an expedient test of power, which, however, requires no great personal and creative application, but is displayed easily and smoothly, because its content is a given quantity. We might define it as the child of thought and thoughtlessness. It affords the pregnant possibility of continually extending the greatest creations of the human spirit, without the aid of the forces which were originally the very condition of their birth. Imitation, furthermore, gives to the individual the satisfaction of not standing alone in his actions. Whenever we imitate, we transfer not only the demand for creative activity, but also the responsibility for the action from ourselves to another. Thus the individual is freed from the worry of choosing and appears simply as a creature of the group, as a vessel of the social contents.

The tendency towards imitation characterizes a stage of development in which the desire for expedient personal activity is present, but from which the capacity for possessing the individual acquirements is absent. It is interesting to note the exactness with which children insist upon the repetition of facts, how they constantly clamor for a repetition of the same games and pastimes, how they will object to the slightest variation in the telling of a story they have heard twenty times. In this imitation and in exact adaptation to the past the child first rises above its momentary existence; the immediate content of life reaches into the past, it expands the present for the child, likewise for primitive man; and the pedantic exactness of this adaptation to the given formula need not be regarded offhand as a token of poverty or narrowness. At this stage every deviation from imitation of the given facts breaks the connection which alone can now unite the present with something that is more than the present, something that tends to expand existence as a mere creature of the moment. The advance beyond this stage is reflected in the circumstance that our thoughts, actions, and feelings are determined by the future as well as by fixed, past, and traditional factors: the teleological individual represents the counterpole of the imitative mortal. The imitator is the passive individual, who believes in social similarity and adapts himself to existing elements; the teleological individual, on the other hand, is ever experimenting, always restlessly striving, and he relies on his own personal conviction.

Thus we see that imitation in all the instances where it is a productive factor represents one of the fundamental tendencies of our character,

namely, that which contents itself with similarity, with uniformity, with the adaptation of the special to the general, and accentuates the constant element in change. Conversely, wherever prominence is given to change, wherever individual differentiation, independence, and relief from generality are sought, there imitation is the negative and obstructive principle. The principle of adherence to given formulas, of being and of acting like others, is irreconcilably opposed to the striving to advance to ever new and individual forms of life; for this very reason social life represents a battleground, of which every inch is stubbornly contested, and social institutions may be looked upon as the peace-treaties, in which the constant antagonism of both principles has been reduced externally to a form of coöperation.

The vital conditions of fashion as a universal phenomenon in the history of our race are circumscribed by these conceptions. Fashion is the imitation of a given example and satisfies the demand for social adaptation; it leads the individual upon the road which all travel, it furnishes a general condition, which resolves the conduct of every individual into a mere example. At the same time it satisfies in no less degree the need of differentiation, the tendency towards dissimilarity, the desire for change and contrast, on the one hand by a constant change of contents, which gives to the fashion of to-day an individual stamp as opposed to that of yesterday and of to-morrow, on the other hand because fashions differ for different classes—the fashions of the upper stratum of society are never identical with those of the lower; in fact, they are abandoned by the former as soon as the latter prepares to appropriate them. Thus fashion represents nothing more than one of the many forms of life by the aid of which we seek to combine in uniform spheres of activity the tendency towards social equalization with the desire for individual differentiation and change. Every phase of the conflicting pair strives visibly beyond the degree of satisfaction that any fashion offers to an absolute control of the sphere of life in question. If we should study the history of fashions (which hitherto have been examined only from the view-point of the development of their contents) in connection with their importance for the form of the social process, we should find that it reflects the history of the attempts to adjust the satisfaction of the two counter-tendencies more and more perfectly to the condition of the existing individual and social culture. The various psychological elements in fashion all conform to this fundamental principle.

Fashion, as noted above, is a product of class distinction and operates like a number of other forms, honor especially, the double function of which consists in revolving within a given circle and at the same time emphasizing it as separate from others. Just as the frame of a picture char-

acterizes the work of art inwardly as a coherent, homogeneous, independent entity and at the same time outwardly severs all direct relations with the surrounding space, just as the uniform energy of such forms cannot be expressed unless we determine the double effect, both inward and outward, so honor owes its character, and above all its moral rights, to the fact that the individual in his personal honor at the same time represents and maintains that of his social circle and his class. These moral rights, however, are frequently considered unjust by those without the pale. Thus fashion on the one hand signifies union with those in the same class, the uniformity of a circle characterized by it, and, *uno actu*, the exclusion of all other groups.

Union and segregation are the two fundamental functions which are here inseparably united, and one of which, although or because it forms a logical contrast to the other, becomes the condition of its realization. Fashion is merely a product of social demands, even though the individual object which it creates or recreates may represent a more or less individual need. This is clearly proved by the fact that very frequently not the slightest reason can be found for the creations of fashion from the standpoint of an objective, æsthetic, or other expediency. While in general our wearing apparel is really adapted to our needs, there is not a trace of expediency in the method by which fashion dictates, for example, whether wide or narrow trousers, colored or black scarfs shall be worn. As a rule the material justification for an action coincides with its general adoption, but in the case of fashion there is a complete separation of the two elements, and there remains for the individual only this general acceptance as the deciding motive to appropriate it. Judging from the ugly and repugnant things that are sometimes in vogue, it would seem as though fashion were desirous of exhibiting its power by getting us to adopt the most atrocious things for its sake alone. The absolute indifference of fashion to the material standards of life is well illustrated by the way in which it recommends something appropriate in one instance, something abstruse in another, and something materially and æsthetically quite indifferent in a third. The only motivations with which fashion is concerned are formal social ones. The reason why even æsthetically impossible styles seem *distingué*, elegant, and artistically tolerable when affected by persons who carry them to the extreme, is that the persons who do this are generally the most elegant and pay the greatest attention to their personal appearance, so that under any circumstances we would get the impression of something *distingué* and æsthetically cultivated. This impression we credit to the questionable element of fashion, the latter appealing to our consciousness as the new and consequently most conspicuous feature of the *tout ensemble*.

Fashion occasionally will accept objectively determined subjects such as religious faith, scientific interests, even socialism and individualism; but it does not become operative as fashion until these subjects can be considered independent of the deeper human motives from which they have risen. For this reason the rule of fashion becomes in such fields unendurable. We therefore see that there is good reason why externals—clothing, social conduct, amusements—constitute the specific field of fashion, for here no dependence is placed on really vital motives of human action. It is the field which we can most easily relinquish to the bent towards imitation, which it would be a sin to follow in important questions. We encounter here a close connection between the consciousness of personality and that of the material forms of life, a connection that runs all through history. The more objective our view of life has become in the last centuries, the more it has stripped the picture of nature of all subjective and anthropomorphic elements, and the more sharply has the conception of individual personality become defined. The social regulation of our inner and outer life is a sort of embryo condition, in which the contrasts of the purely personal and the purely objective are differentiated, the action being synchronous and reciprocal. Therefore wherever man appears essentially as a social being we observe neither strict objectivity in the view of life nor absorption and independence in the consciousness of personality.

Social forms, apparel, æsthetic judgment, the whole style of human expression, are constantly transformed by fashion, in such a way, however, that fashion—*i.e.*, the latest fashion—in all these things affects only the upper classes. Just as soon as the lower classes begin to copy their style, thereby crossing the line of demarcation the upper classes have drawn and destroying the uniformity of their coherence, the upper classes turn away from this style and adopt a new one, which in its turn differentiates them from the masses; and thus the game goes merrily on. Naturally the lower classes look and strive towards the upper, and they encounter the least resistance in those fields which are subject to the whims of fashion; for it is here that mere external imitation is most readily applied. The same process is at work as between the different sets within the upper classes, although it is not always as visible here as it is, for example, between mistress and maid. Indeed, we may often observe that the more nearly one set has approached another, the more frantic becomes the desire for imitation from below and the seeking for the new from above. The increase of wealth is bound to hasten the process considerably and render it visible, because the objects of fashion, embracing as they do the externals of life, are most accessible to the mere call of money, and conformity to the higher set

is more easily acquired here than in fields which demand an individual test that gold and silver cannot affect.

We see, therefore, that in addition to the element of imitation the element of demarcation constitutes an important factor of fashion. This is especially noticeable wherever the social structure does not include any super-imposed groups, in which case fashion asserts itself in neighboring groups. Among primitive peoples we often find that closely connected groups living under exactly similar conditions develop sharply differentiated fashions, by means of which each group establishes uniformity within, as well as difference without the prescribed set. On the other hand, there exists a widespread predilection for importing fashions from without, and such foreign fashions assume a greater value within the circle, simply because they did not originate there. The prophet Zephaniah expressed his indignation at the aristocrats who affected imported apparel. As a matter of fact the exotic origin of fashions seems strongly to favor the exclusiveness of the groups which adopt them. Because of their external origin, these imported fashions create a special and significant form of socialization, which arises through mutual relation to a point without the circle. It sometimes appears as though social elements, just like the axes of vision, converge best at a point that is not too near. The currency, or more precisely the medium of exchange among primitive races, often consists of objects that are brought in from without. On the Solomon Islands, and at Ibo on the Niger, for example, there exists a regular industry for the manufacture of money from shells, etc., which are not employed as a medium of exchange in the place itself, but in neighboring districts, to which they are exported. Paris modes are frequently created with the sole intention of setting a fashion elsewhere.

This motive of foreignness, which fashion employs in its socializing endeavors, is restricted to higher civilization, because novelty, which foreign origin guarantees in extreme form, is often regarded by primitive races as an evil. This is certainly one of the reasons why primitive conditions of life favor a correspondingly infrequent change of fashions. The savage is afraid of strange appearances; the difficulties and dangers that beset his career cause him to scent danger in anything new which he does not understand and which he cannot assign to a familiar category. Civilization, however, transforms this affectation into its very opposite. Whatever is exceptional, bizarre, or conspicuous, or whatever departs from the customary norm, exercises a peculiar charm upon the man of culture, entirely independent of its material justification. The removal of the feeling of insecurity with reference to all things new was accomplished by the progress of civilization. At the same time it may be the old inherited prejudice,

although it has become purely formal and unconscious, which, in connection with the present feeling of security, produces this piquant interest in exceptional and odd things. For this reason the fashions of the upper classes develop their power of exclusion against the lower in proportion as general culture advances, at least until the mingling of the classes and the leveling effect of democracy exert a counter-influence.

Fashion plays a more conspicuous *rôle* in modern times, because the differences in our standards of life have become so much more strongly accentuated, for the more numerous and the more sharply drawn these differences are, the greater are the opportunities for emphasizing them at every turn. In innumerable instances this cannot be accomplished by passive inactivity, but only by the development of forms established by fashion; and this has become all the more pronounced since legal restrictions prescribing various forms of apparel and modes of life for different classes have been removed.

Two social tendencies are essential to the establishment of fashion, namely, the need of union on the one hand and the need of isolation on the other. Should one of these be absent, fashion will not be formed—its sway will abruptly end. Consequently the lower classes possess very few modes and those they have are seldom specific; for this reason the modes of primitive races are much more stable than ours. Among primitive races the socializing impulse is much more powerfully developed than the differentiating impulse. For, no matter how decisively the groups may be separated from one another, separation is for the most part hostile in such a way, that the very relation the rejection of which within the classes of civilized races makes fashion reasonable, is absolutely lacking. Segregation by means of differences in clothing, manners, taste, etc., is expedient only where the danger of absorption and obliteration exists, as is the case among highly civilized nations. Where these differences do not exist, where we have an absolute antagonism, as for example between not directly friendly groups of primitive races, the development of fashion has no sense at all.

It is interesting to observe how the prevalence of the socializing impulse in primitive peoples affects various institutions, such as the dance. It has been noted quite generally that the dances of primitive races exhibit a remarkable uniformity in arrangement and rhythm. The dancing group feels and acts like a uniform organism; the dance forces and accustoms a number of individuals, who are usually driven to and fro without rime or reason by vacillating conditions and needs of life, to be guided by a common impulse and a single common motive. Even making allowances for the tremendous difference in the outward appearance of the dance, we are

dealing here with the same element that appears in the socializing force of fashion. Movement, time, rhythm of the gestures, are all undoubtedly influenced largely by what is worn: similarly dressed persons exhibit relative similarity in their actions. This is of especial value in modern life with its individualistic diffusion, while in the case of primitive races the effect produced is directed within and is therefore not dependent upon changes of fashion. Among primitive races fashions will be less numerous and more stable because the need of new impressions and forms of life, quite apart from their social effect, is far less pressing. Changes in fashion reflect the dulness of nervous impulses: the more nervous the age, the more rapidly its fashions change, simply because the desire for differentiation, one of the most important elements of all fashion, goes hand in hand with the weakening of nervous energy. This fact in itself is one of the reasons why the real seat of fashion is found among the upper classes.

Viewed from a purely social standpoint, two neighboring primitive races furnish eloquent examples of the requirement of the two elements of union and isolation in the setting of fashion. Among the Kaffirs the class-system is very strongly developed, and as a result we find there a fairly rapid change of fashions, in spite of the fact that wearing-apparel and adornments are subject to certain legal restrictions. The Bushmen, on the other hand, who have developed no class-system, have no fashions whatsoever,—no one has been able to discover among them any interest in changes in apparel and in finery. Occasionally these negative elements have consciously prevented the setting of a fashion even at the very heights of civilization. It is said that there was no ruling fashion in male attire in Florence about the year 1390, because every one adopted a style of his own. Here the first element, the need of union, was absent; and without it, as we have seen, no fashion can arise. Conversely, the Venetian nobles are said to have set no fashion, for according to law they had to dress in black in order not to call the attention of the lower classes to the smallness of their number. Here there were no fashions because the other element essential for their creation was lacking, a visible differentiation from the lower classes being purposely avoided.

The very character of fashion demands that it should be exercised at one time only by a portion of the given group, the great majority being merely on the road to adopting it. As soon as an example has been universally adopted, that is, as soon as anything that was originally done only by a few has really come to be practiced by all—as is the case in certain portions of our apparel and in various forms of social conduct—we no longer speak of fashion. As fashion spreads, it gradually goes to its

doom. The distinctiveness which in the early stages of a set fashion assures for it a certain distribution is destroyed as the fashion spreads, and as this element wanes, the fashion also is bound to die. By reason of this peculiar play between the tendency towards universal acceptance and the destruction of its very purpose to which this general adoption leads, fashion includes a peculiar attraction of limitation, the attraction of a simultaneous beginning and end, the charm of novelty coupled to that of transitoriness. The attractions of both poles of the phenomena meet in fashion, and show also here that they belong together unconditionally, although, or rather because, they are contradictory in their very nature. Fashion always occupies the dividing-line between the past and the future, and consequently conveys a stronger feeling of the present, at least while it is at its height, than most other phenomena. What we call the present is usually nothing more than a combination of a fragment of the past with a fragment of the future. Attention is called to the present less often than colloquial usage, which is rather liberal in its employment of the word, would lead us to believe.

Few phenomena of social life possess such a pointed curve of consciousness as does fashion. As soon as the social consciousness attains to the highest point designated by fashion, it marks the beginning of the end for the latter. This transitory character of fashion, however, does not on the whole degrade it, but adds a new element of attraction. At all events an object does not suffer degradation by being called fashionable, unless we reject it with disgust or wish to debase it for other, material reasons, in which case, of course, fashion becomes an idea of value. In the practice of life anything else similarly new and suddenly disseminated is not called fashion, when we are convinced of its continuance and its material justification. If, on the other hand, we feel certain that the fact will vanish as rapidly as it came, then we call it fashion. We can discover one of the reasons why in these latter days fashion exercises such a powerful influence on our consciousness in the circumstance that the great, permanent, unquestionable convictions are continually losing strength, as a consequence of which the transitory and vacillating elements of life acquire more room for the display of their activity. The break with the past, which, for more than a century, civilized mankind has been laboring unceasingly to bring about, makes the consciousness turn more and more to the present. This accentuation of the present evidently at the same time emphasizes the element of change, and a class will turn to fashion in all fields, by no means only in that of apparel, in proportion to the degree in which it supports the given civilizing tendency. It may almost be considered a sign of the increased power of fashion, that it has overstepped the bounds of its original domain, which

comprised only personal externals, and has acquired an increasing influence over taste, over theoretical convictions, and even over the moral foundations of life.

From the fact that fashion as such can never be generally in vogue, the individual derives the satisfaction of knowing that as adopted by him it still represents something special and striking, while at the same time he feels inwardly supported by a set of persons who are striving for the same thing, not as in the case of other social satisfactions, by a set actually doing the same thing. The fashionable person is regarded with mingled feelings of approval and envy; we envy him as an individual, but approve of him as a member of a set or group. Yet even this envy has a peculiar coloring. There is a shade of envy which includes a species of ideal participation in the envied object itself. An instructive example of this is furnished by the conduct of the poor man who gets a glimpse of the feast of his rich neighbor. The moment we envy an object or a person, we are no longer absolutely excluded from it; some relation or other has been established—between both the same psychic content now exists—although in entirely different categories and forms of sensations. This quiet personal usurpation of the envied property contains a kind of antidote, which occasionally counteracts the evil effects of this feeling of envy. The contents of fashion afford an especially good chance for the development of this conciliatory shade of envy, which also gives to the envied person a better conscience because of his satisfaction over his good fortune. This is due to the fact that these contents are not, as many other psychic contents are, denied absolutely to any one, for a change of fortune, which is never entirely out of the question, may play them into the hands of an individual who had previously been confined to the state of envy.

From all this we see that fashion furnishes an ideal field for individuals with dependent natures, whose self-consciousness, however, requires a certain amount of prominence, attention, and singularity. Fashion raises even the unimportant individual by making him the representative of a class, the embodiment of a joint spirit. And here again we observe the curious intermixture of antagonistic values. Speaking broadly, it is characteristic of a standard set by a general body, that its acceptance by any one individual does not call attention to him; in other words, a positive adoption of a given norm signifies nothing. Whoever keeps the laws the breaking of which is punished by the penal code, whoever lives up to the social forms prescribed by his class, gains no conspicuousness or notoriety. The slightest infraction or opposition, however, is immediately noticed and places the individual in an exceptional position by calling the attention of the public to

his action. All such norms do not assume positive importance for the individual until he begins to depart from them. It is peculiarly characteristic of fashion that it renders possible a social obedience, which at the same time is a form of individual differentiation. Fashion does this because in its very nature it represents a standard that can never be accepted by all. While fashion postulates a certain amount of general acceptance, it nevertheless is not without significance in the characterization of the individual, for it emphasizes his personality not only through omission but also through observance. In the dude the social demands of fashion appear exaggerated to such a degree that they completely assume an individualistic and peculiar character. It is characteristic of the dude that he carries the elements of a particular fashion to an extreme; when pointed shoes are in style, he wears shoes that resemble the prow of a ship; when high collars are all the rage, he wears collars that come up to his ears; when scientific lectures are fashionable, you cannot find him anywhere else, etc., etc. Thus he represents something distinctly individual, which consists in the quantitative intensification of such elements as are qualitatively common property of the given set or class. He leads the way, but all travel the same road. Representing as he does the most recently conquered heights of public taste, he seems to be marching at the head of the general procession. In reality, however, what is so frequently true of the relation between individuals and groups applies also to him: as a matter of fact, the leader allows himself to be led.

Democratic times unquestionably favor such a condition to a remarkable degree, so much so that even Bismarck and other very prominent party leaders in constitutional governments have emphasized the fact that inasmuch as they are leaders of a group, they are bound to follow it. The spirit of democracy causes persons to seek the dignity and sensation of command in this manner; it tends to a confusion and ambiguity of sensations, which fail to distinguish between ruling the mass and being ruled by it. The conceit of the dude is thus the caricature of a confused understanding, fostered by democracy, of the relation between the individual and the public. Undeniably, however, the dude, through the conspicuousness gained in a purely quantitative way, but expressed in a difference of quality, represents a state of equilibrium between the social and the individualizing impulses which is really original. This explains the extreme to which otherwise thoroughly intelligent and prominent persons frequently resort in matters of fashion, an extreme that outwardly appears so abstruse. It furnishes a combination of relations to things and men, which under ordinary circumstances appear more divided. It is not only the mixture of individual

peculiarity with social equality, but, in a more practical vein, as it were, it is the mingling of the sensation of rulership with submission, the influence of which is here at work. In other words, we have here the mixing of a masculine and a feminine principle. The very fact that this process goes on in the field of fashion only in an ideal attenuation, as it were, the fact that only the form of both elements is embodied in a content indifferent in itself, may lend to fashion a special attraction, especially for sensitive natures that do not care to concern themselves with robust reality. From an objective standpoint, life according to fashion consists of a balancing of destruction and upbuilding; its content acquires characteristics by destruction of an earlier form; it possesses a peculiar uniformity, in which the satisfying of the love of destruction and of the demand for positive elements can no longer be separated from each other.

Inasmuch as we are dealing here not with the importance of a single fact or a single satisfaction, but rather with the play between two contents and their mutual distinction, it becomes evident that the same combination which extreme obedience to fashion acquires can be won also by opposition to it. Whoever consciously avoids following the fashion, does not attain the consequent sensation of individualization through any real individual qualification, but rather through mere negation of the social example. If obedience to fashion consists in imitation of such an example, conscious neglect of fashion represents similar imitation, but under an inverse sign. The latter, however, furnishes just as fair testimony of the power of the social tendency, which demands our dependence in some positive or negative manner. The man who consciously pays no heed to fashion accepts its forms just as much as the dude does, only he embodies it in another category, the former in that of exaggeration, the latter in that of negation. Indeed, it occasionally happens that it becomes fashionable in whole bodies of a large class to depart altogether from the standards set by fashion. This constitutes a most curious social-psychological complication, in which the tendency towards individual conspicuousness primarily rests content with a mere inversion of the social imitation and secondly draws its strength from approximation to a similarly characterized narrower circle. If the club-haters organized themselves into a club, it would not be logically more impossible and psychologically more possible than the above case. Similarly atheism has been made into a religion, embodying the same fanaticism, the same intolerance, the same satisfying of the needs of the soul that are embraced in religion proper. Freedom, likewise, after having put a stop to tyranny, frequently becomes no less tyrannical and arbitrary. So the phenomenon of conscious departure from fashion illustrates

how ready the fundamental forms of human character are to accept the total antithesis of contents and to show their strength and their attraction in the negation of the very thing to whose acceptance they seemed a moment before irrevocably committed. It is often absolutely impossible to tell whether the elements of personal strength or of personal weakness preponderate in the group of causes that lead to such a departure from fashion. It may result from a desire not to make common cause with the mass, a desire that has at its basis not independence of the mass, to be sure, but yet an inherently sovereign position with respect to the latter. However, it may be due to a delicate sensibility, which causes the individual to fear that he will be unable to maintain his individuality in case he adopts the forms, the tastes, and the customs of the general public. Such opposition is by no means always a sign of personal strength.

The fact that fashion expresses and at the same time emphasizes the tendency towards equalization and individualization, and the desire for imitation and conspicuousness, perhaps explains why it is that women, broadly speaking, are its staunchest adherents. Scientific discretion should caution us against forming judgments about woman "in the plural." At the same time it may be said of woman in a general way, whether the statement be justified in every case or not, that her psychological characteristic in so far as it differs from that of man, consists in a lack of differentiation, in a greater similarity among the different members of her sex, in a stricter adherence to the social average. Whether on the final heights of modern culture, the facts of which have not yet furnished a contribution to the formation of this general conviction, there will be a change in the relation between men and women, a change that may result in a complete reversal of the above distinction, I do not care to discuss, inasmuch as we are concerned here with more comprehensive historical averages. This relation and the weakness of her social position, to which woman has been doomed during the far greater portion of history, however, explains her strict regard for custom, for the generally accepted and approved forms of life, for all that is proper. A weak person steers clear of individualization; he avoids dependence upon self with its responsibilities and the necessity of defending himself unaided. He finds protection only in the typical form of life, which prevents the strong from exercising his exceptional powers. But resting on the firm foundation of custom, of what is generally accepted, woman strives anxiously for all the relative individualization and personal conspicuousness that remains.

Fashion furnishes this very combination in the happiest manner, for we have here on the one hand a field of general imitation, the individual float-

ing in the broadest social current, relieved of responsibility for his tastes and his actions, yet on the other hand we have a certain conspicuousness, an emphasis, an individual accentuation of the personality. It seems that there exists for each class of human beings, probably for each individual, a definite quantitative relation between the tendency towards individualization and the desire to be merged in the group, so that when the satisfying of one tendency is denied in a certain field of life, he seeks another, in which he then fulfills the measure which he requires. Thus it seems as though fashion were the valve through which woman's craving for some measure of conspicuousness and individual prominence finds vent, when its satisfaction is denied her in other fields.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Germany exhibits an unusually strong development of individuality. Great inroads were made upon collectivistic regulations of the Middle Ages by the freedom of the individual. Woman, however, took no part in this individualistic development: the freedom of personal action and self-improvement were still denied her. She sought redress by adopting the most extravagant and hypertrophic styles in dress. On the other hand, in Italy during the same epoch woman was given full play for the exercise of individuality. The woman of the Renaissance possessed opportunities of culture, of external activity, of personal differentiation such as were not offered her for many centuries thereafter. In the upper classes of society, especially, education and freedom of action were almost identical for both sexes. It is not astonishing, therefore, that no particularly extravagant Italian female fashions should have come down to us from that period. The need of exercising individuality in this field was absent, because the tendency embodied therein found sufficient vent in other spheres. In general the history of woman in the outer as well as the inner life, individually as well as collectively, exhibits such a comparatively great uniformity, leveling and similarity, that she requires a more lively activity at least in the sphere of fashion, which is nothing more nor less than change, in order to add an attraction to herself and her life for her own feeling as well as for others. Just as in the case of individualism and collectivism, there exists between the uniformity and the change of the contents of life a definite proportion of needs, which is tossed to and fro in the different fields and seeks to balance refusal in one by consent, however acquired, in another. On the whole, we may say that woman is a more faithful creature than man. Now fidelity, expressing as it does the uniformity and regularity of one's nature only in the direction of the feelings, demands a more lively change in the outward surrounding spheres in order to establish the balance in the tendencies of life referred to above. Man,

on the other hand, a rather unfaithful being, who does not ordinarily restrict dependence to a relation of the feelings with the same implicitness and concentration of all interests of life to a single one, is consequently less in need of an outward form of change. Non-acceptance of changes in external fields, and indifference towards fashions in outward appearance are specifically a male quality, not because man is the more uniform but because he is the more many-sided creature and for that reason can get along better without such outward changes. Therefore, the emancipated woman of the present, who seeks to imitate in the good as well as perhaps also in the bad sense the whole differentiation, personality and activity of the male sex, lays particular stress on her indifference to fashion.

In a certain sense fashion gives woman a compensation for her lack of position in a class based on a calling or profession. The man who has become absorbed in a calling has entered a relatively uniform class, within which he resembles many others, and is thus often only an illustration of the conception of this class or calling. On the other hand, as though to compensate him for this absorption, he is invested with the full importance and the objective as well as social power of this class. To his individual importance is added that of his class, which often covers the defects and deficiencies of his purely personal character. The individuality of the class often supplements or replaces that of the member. This identical thing fashion accomplishes with other means. Fashion also supplements a person's lack of importance, his inability to individualize his existence purely by his own unaided efforts, by enabling him to join a set characterized and singled out in the public consciousness by fashion alone. Here also, to be sure, the personality as such is reduced to a general formula, yet this formula itself, from a social standpoint, possesses an individual tinge, and thus makes up through the social way what is denied to the personality in a purely individual way. The fact that the demi-monde is so frequently a pioneer in matters of fashion, is due to its peculiarly uprooted form of life. The pariah existence to which society condemns the demi-monde, produces an open or latent hatred against everything that has the sanction of law, of every permanent institution, a hatred that finds its relatively most innocent and æsthetic expression in the striving for ever new forms of appearance. In this continual striving for new, previously unheard-of fashions, in the regardlessness with which the one that is most diametrically opposed to the existing one is passionately adopted, there lurks an æsthetic expression of the desire for destruction, which seems to be an element peculiar to all that lead this pariah-like existence, so long as they are not completely enslaved within.

When we examine the final and most subtle impulses of the soul, which it is difficult to express in words, we find that they also exhibit this antagonistic play of the fundamental human tendencies. These latter seek to regain their continually lost balance by means of ever new proportions, and they succeed here through the reflection which fashion occasionally throws into the most delicate and tender spiritual processes. Fashion insists, to be sure, on treating all individualities alike, yet it is always done in such a way that one's whole nature is never affected. Fashion always continues to be regarded as something external, even in spheres outside of mere styles of apparel, for the form of mutability in which it is presented to the individual is under all circumstances a contrast to the stability of the ego-feeling. Indeed, the latter, through this contrast, must become conscious of its relative duration. The changeableness of those contents can express itself as mutability and develop its attraction only through this enduring element. But for this very reason fashion always stands, as I have pointed out, at the periphery of personality, which regards itself as a *pièce de résistance* for fashion, or at least can do so when called upon.

It is this phase of fashion that is received by sensitive and peculiar persons, who use it as a sort of mask. They consider blind obedience to the standards of the general public in all externals as the conscious and desired means of reserving their personal feeling and their taste, which they are eager to reserve for themselves alone, in such a way that they do not care to have it enter in an appearance that is visible to all. It is therefore a feeling of modesty and reserve which causes many a delicate nature to seek refuge in the leveling cloak of fashion; such individuals do not care to resort to a peculiarity in externals for fear of perhaps betraying a peculiarity of their innermost soul. We have here a triumph of the soul over the actual circumstances of existence, which must be considered one of the highest and finest victories, at least as far as form is concerned, for the reasons that the enemy himself is transformed into a servant, and that the very thing which the personality seemed to suppress is voluntarily seized, because the leveling suppression is here transferred to the external spheres of life in such a way that it furnishes a veil and a protection for everything spiritual and now all the more free. This corresponds exactly to the triviality of expression and conversation through which very sensitive and retiring people, especially women, often deceive one about the individual depth of the soul. It is one of the pleasures of the judge of human nature, although somewhat cruel withal, to feel the anxiousness with which woman clings to the commonplace contents and forms of social intercourse. The impossibility of enticing her beyond the most banal and trite forms of ex-

pression, which often drives one to despair, in innumerable instances signifies nothing more than a barricade of the soul, an iron mask that conceals the real features and can furnish this service only by means of a wholly uncompromising separation of the feelings and the externals of life.

All feeling of shame rests upon isolation of the individual; it arises whenever stress is laid upon the *ego*, whenever the attention of a circle is drawn to such an individual—in reality or only in his imagination—which at the same time is felt to be in some way incongruous. For that reason retiring and weak natures particularly incline to feelings of shame. The moment they step into the centre of general attention, the moment they make themselves conspicuous in any way, a painful oscillation between emphasis and withdrawal of the *ego* becomes manifest. Inasmuch as the individual departure from a generality as the source of the feeling of shame is quite independent of the particular content upon the basis of which it occurs, one is frequently ashamed of good and noble things. The fact that the commonplace is good form in society in the narrower sense of the term, is due not only to a mutual regard, which causes it to be considered bad taste to make one's self conspicuous through some individual, singular expression that not every one can repeat, but also to the fear of that feeling of shame which as it were forms a self-inflicted punishment for the departure from the form and activity similar for all and equally accessible to all. By reason of its peculiar inner structure, fashion furnishes a departure of the individual, which is always looked upon as proper. No matter how extravagant the form of appearance or manner of expression, as long as it is fashionable, it is protected against those painful reflections which the individual otherwise experiences when he becomes the object of attention. All concerted actions are characterized by the loss of this feeling of shame. As a member of a mass the individual will do many things which would have aroused unconquerable repugnance in his soul had they been suggested to him alone. It is one of the strangest social-psychological phenomena, in which this characteristic of concerted action is well exemplified, that many fashions tolerate breaches of modesty which, if suggested to the individual alone, would be angrily repudiated. But as dictates of fashion they find ready acceptance. The feeling of shame is eradicated in matters of fashion, because it represents a united action, in the same way that the feeling of responsibility is extinguished in the participants of a crime committed by a mob, each member of which, if left to himself, would shrink from violence.

Fashion also is only one of the forms by the aid of which men seek to save their inner freedom all the more completely by sacrificing externals to enslavement by the general public. Freedom and dependence also belong to

those antagonistic pairs, whose ever renewed strife and endless mobility give to life much more piquancy and permit of a much greater breadth and development, than a permanent, unchangeable balance of the two could give. Schopenhauer held that each person's cup of life is filled with a certain quantity of joy and woe, and that this measure can neither remain empty nor be filled to overflowing, but only changes its form in all the differentiations and vacillations of internal and external relations. In the same way and much less mystically we may observe in each period, in each class, and in each individual, either a really permanent proportion of dependence and freedom, or at least the longing for it, whereas we can only change the fields over which they are distributed. It is the task of the higher life, to be sure, to arrange this distribution in such a way that the other values of existence require thereby the possibility of the most favorable development. The same quantity of dependence and freedom may at one time help to increase the moral, intellectual, and æsthetic values to the highest point and at another time, without any change in quantity but merely in distribution, it may bring about the exact opposite of this success. Speaking broadly, we may say that the most favorable result for the aggregate value of life will be obtained when all unavoidable dependence is transferred more and more to the periphery, to the externals of life. Perhaps Goethe, in his later period, is the most eloquent example of a wholly great life, for by means of his adaptability in all externals, his strict regard for form, his willing obedience to the conventions of society, he attained a maximum of inner freedom, a complete saving of the centres of life from the touch of the unavoidable quantity of dependence. In this respect fashion is also a social form of marvelous expediency, because, like the law, it affects only the externals of life, only those sides of life which are turned to society. It provides us with a formula by means of which we can unequivocally attest our dependence upon what is generally adopted, our obedience to the standards established by our time, our class, and our narrower circle, and enables us to withdraw the freedom given us in life from externals and concentrate it more and more in our innermost natures.

Within the individual soul the relations of equalizing unification and individual demarcation are to a certain extent repeated. The antagonism of the tendencies which produces fashion is transferred as far as form is concerned in an entirely similar manner also to those inner relations of many individuals, who have nothing whatever to do with social obligations. The instances to which I have just referred exhibit the oft-mentioned parallelism with which the relations between individuals are repeated in the correlation between the psychic elements of the individual himself. With more

or less intention the individual often establishes a mode of conduct or a style for himself, which by reason of the rhythm of its rise, sway, and decline becomes characterized in fashion. Young people especially often exhibit a sudden strangeness in behavior; an unexpected, objectively unfounded interest arises and governs their whole sphere of consciousness, only to disappear in the same irrational manner. We might call this a personal fashion, which forms an analogy to social fashion. The former is supported on the one hand by the individual demand for differentiation and thereby attests to the same impulse that is active in the formation of social fashion. The need of imitation, of similarity, of the blending of the individual in the mass, are here satisfied purely within the individual himself, namely, through the concentration of the personal consciousness upon this one form or content, as well as through the imitation of his own self, as it were, which here takes the place of imitation of others. Indeed, we might say that we attain in this case an even more pronounced concentration, an even more intimate support of the individual contents of life by a central uniformity than we do where the fashion is common property.

A certain intermediate stage is often realized within narrow circles between individual mode and personal fashion. Ordinary persons frequently adopt some expression, which they apply at every opportunity—in common with as many as possible in the same set—to all manner of suitable or unsuitable objects. In one respect this is a group fashion, yet in another respect it is really individual, for its express purpose consists in having the individual make the totality of his circle of ideas subject to this formula. Brutal violence is hereby committed against the individuality of things; all variation is destroyed by the curious supremacy of this one category of expressions, for example, when we designate all things that happen to please us for any reason whatsoever as “*chic*,” or “*smart*,” even though the objects in question may bear no relation whatsoever to the fields to which these expressions belong. In this manner the inner world of the individual is made subject to fashion, and thus reflects the aspects of the external group governed by fashion, chiefly by reason of the objective absurdity of such individual manners, which illustrate the power of the formal, unifying element over the objective rational element. In the same way many persons and circles only ask that they be uniformly governed, without thinking to inquire into the nature or value of the authority. It cannot be denied that inasmuch as violence is done to objects treated in this way, and inasmuch as they are all transformed uniformly to a category of our own making, the individual really renders an arbitrary decision with respect to these objects, he acquires an individual feeling of power, and thus the *ego* is strongly emphasized.

The fact that appears here in the light of a caricature is everywhere noticeable to a less pronounced degree in the relation of persons to things. Only the noblest persons seek the greatest depth and power of their *ego* by respecting the individuality inherent in things. The hostility which the soul bears to the supremacy, independence, and indifference of the universe gives rise—beside the loftiest and most valuable strivings of humanity—to attempts to oppress things externally; the *ego* offers violence to them not by absorbing and molding their powers, not by recognizing their individuality only to make it serviceable, but by forcing it to bow outwardly to some subjective formula. To be sure the *ego* has not in reality gained control of the things, but only of its own false and fanciful conception of them. The feeling of power, however, which originates thus, betrays its lack of foundation and its fanciful origin by the rapidity with which such expressions pass by. It is just as illusionary as the feeling of the uniformity of being, which springs for the moment from this formulating of all expressions. As a matter of fact the man who carries out a schematic similarity of conduct under all circumstances is by no means the most consistent, the one asserting the *ego* most regularly against the universe. On account of the difference in the given factors of life, a difference of conduct will be essential whenever the same germ of the *ego* is to prevail uniformly over all, just as identical answers in a calculation into which two factors enter, of which one continually varies, cannot be secured if the other remains unchanged, but only if the latter undergoes variations corresponding to the changes of the former.

We have seen that in fashion the different dimensions of life, so to speak, acquire a peculiar convergence, that fashion is a complex structure in which all the leading antithetical tendencies of the soul are represented in one way or another. This will make clear that the total rhythm in which the individuals and the groups move will exert an important influence also upon their relation to fashion, that the various strata of a group, altogether aside from their different contents of life and external possibilities, will bear different relations to fashion simply because their contents of life are evolved either in conservative or in rapidly varying form. On the one hand the lower classes are difficult to put in motion and they develop slowly. A very clear and instructive example of this may be found in the attitude of the lower classes in England towards the Danish and the Norman conquests. On the whole the changes brought about affected the upper classes only; in the lower classes we find such a degree of fidelity to arrangements and forms of life that the whole continuity of English life which was retained through all those national vicissitudes rests entirely upon the persistence and immovable conservatism of the lower classes. The

upper classes, however, were most intensely affected and transformed by new influences, just as the upper branches of a tree are most responsive to the movements of the air. The highest classes, as everyone knows, are the most conservative, and frequently enough they are even archaic. They dread every motion and change, not because they have an antipathy for the contents or because the latter are injurious to them, but simply because it is change and because they regard every modification of the whole, for which in their momentary condition they have felt the greatest concern, as suspicious and dangerous. No change can bring them additional power, and every change can give them something to fear, but nothing to hope for. The real variability of historical life is therefore vested in the middle classes, and for this reason the history of social and cultural movements has fallen into an entirely different pace since the *tiers état* assumed control. For this reason fashion, which represents the variable and contrasting forms of life, has since then become much broader and more animated, and also because of the transformation in the immediate political life, for man requires an ephemeral tyrant the moment he has rid himself of the absolute and permanent one. The frequent change of fashion represents a tremendous subjugation of the individual and in that respect forms one of the essential complements of the increased social and political freedom. A form of life, for the contents of which the moment of acquired height mark the beginning of decline, belongs to a class which is inherently much more variable, much more restless in its rhythms than the lowest classes with their dull, unconscious conservatism, and the highest classes with their consciously desired conservatism. Classes and individuals who demand constant change, because the rapidity of their development gives them the advantage over others, find in fashion something that keeps pace with their own soul-movements. Social advance above all is favorable to the rapid change of fashion, for it capacitates lower classes so much for imitation of upper ones, and thus the process characterized above, according to which every higher set throws aside a fashion the moment a lower set adopts it, has acquired a breadth and activity never dreamed of before.

This fact has important bearing on the content of fashion. Above all else it brings in its train a reduction in the cost and extravagance of fashions. In earlier times there was a compensation for the costliness of the first acquisition or the difficulties in transforming conduct and taste in the longer duration of their sway. The more an article becomes subject to rapid changes of fashion, the greater the demand for *cheap* products of its kind, not only because the larger and therefore poorer classes nevertheless have enough purchasing power to regulate industry and demand objects, which

at least bear the outward semblance of style, but also because even the higher circles of society could not afford to adopt the rapid changes in fashion forced upon them by the imitation of the lower circles, if the objects were not relatively cheap. The rapidity of the development is of such importance in actual articles of fashion that it even withdraws them from certain advances of economy gradually won in other fields. It has been noticed, especially in the older branches of modern productive industry, that the speculative element gradually ceases to play an influential rôle. The movements of the market can be better overlooked, requirements can be better foreseen and production can be more accurately regulated than before, so that the rationalization of production makes greater and greater inroads on chance conjunctures, on the aimless vacillation of supply and demand. Only pure articles of fashion seem to prove an exception. The polar oscillations, which modern economics in many instances know how to avoid and from which it is visibly striving towards entirely new economic orders and forms, still hold sway in the field immediately subject to fashion. The element of feverish change is so essential here that fashion stands, as it were, in a logical contrast to the tendencies for development in modern economics.

In contrast to this characteristic, however, fashion possesses this peculiar quality, that every individual type to a certain extent makes its appearance as though it intended to live forever. When we furnish a house these days, intending the articles to last a quarter of a century, we invariably invest in furniture designed according to the very latest patterns and do not even consider articles in vogue two years before. Yet it is evident that the attraction of fashion will desert the present article just as it left the earlier one, and satisfaction or dissatisfaction with both forms is determined by other material criterions. A peculiar psychological process seems to be at work here in addition to the mere bias of the moment. Some fashion always exists and fashion *per se* is indeed immortal, which fact seems to affect in some manner or other each of its manifestations, although the very nature of each individual fashion stamps it as being transitory. The fact that change itself does not change, in this instance endows each of the objects which it affects with a psychological appearance of duration.

This apparent duration becomes real for the different fashion-contents within the change itself in the following special manner. Fashion, to be sure, is concerned only with change, yet like all phenomena it tends to conserve energy; it endeavors to attain its objects as completely as possible, but nevertheless with the relatively most economical means. For this very reason, fashion repeatedly returns to old forms, as is illustrated particularly in wearing-apparel; and the course of fashion has been likened to a circle.

As soon as an earlier fashion has partially been forgotten there is no reason why it should not be allowed to return to favor and why the charm of difference, which constitutes its very essence, should not be permitted to exercise an influence similar to that which it exerted conversely some time before.

The power of the moving form upon which fashion lives is not strong enough to subject every fact uniformly. Even in the fields governed by fashion, all forms are not equally suited to become fashion, for the peculiar character of many of them furnishes a certain resistance. This may be compared with the unequal relation that the objects of external perception bear to the possibility of their being transformed into works of art. It is a very enticing opinion, but one that cannot hold water, that every real object is equally suited to become the object of a work of art. The forms of art, as they have developed historically—constantly determined by chance, frequently one-sided and affected by technical perfections and imperfections—by no means occupy a neutral height above all world objects. On the contrary, the forms of art bear a closer relation to some facts than they do to others. Many objects assume artistic form without apparent effort, as though nature had created them for that very purpose, while others, as though wilful and supported by nature, avoid all transformation into the given forms of art. The sovereignty of art over reality by no means implies, as naturalism and many theories of idealism so steadfastly maintain, the ability to draw all the contents of existence uniformly into its sphere. None of the forms by which the human mind masters the material of existence and adapts it to its purpose is so general and neutral that all objects, indifferent as they are to their own structure, should uniformly conform to it.

Thus fashion can to all appearances and *in abstracto* absorb any chosen content: any given form of clothing, of art, of conduct, of opinion may become fashionable. And yet many forms in their deeper nature show a special disposition to live themselves out in fashion, just as others offer inward resistance. Thus, for example, everything that may be termed "classic" is comparatively far removed from fashion and alien to it, although occasionally, of course, the classic also falls under the sway of fashion. The nature of the classic is determined by a concentration of the parts around a fixed centre; classic objects possess an air of composure, which does not offer so many points of attack, as it were, from which modification, disturbance, destruction of the equilibrium might emanate. Concentration of the limbs is characteristic of classic plastics: the *tout ensemble* is absolutely governed from within, the spirit and the feeling of life governing the whole

embrace uniformly every single part, because of the perceptible unity of the object. That is the reason we speak of the classic repose of Greek art. It is due exclusively to the concentration of the object, which concentration permits no part to bear any relation to any extraneous powers and fortunes and thereby incites the feeling that this formation is exempt from the changing influences of general life. In contrast to this everything odd, extreme and unusual will be drawn to fashion from within: fashion does not take hold of such characteristic things as an external fate, but rather as the historical expression of their material peculiarities. The widely projecting limbs in baroque-statues seem to be in perpetual danger of being broken off, the inner life of the figure does not exercise complete control over them, but turns them over a prey to the chance influences of external life. Baroque forms in themselves lack repose, they seem ruled by chance and subjected to the momentary impulse, which fashion expresses as a form of social life. But still another factor confronts us here, namely, that we soon grow tired of eccentric, bizarre or fanciful forms and from a purely physiological standpoint long for the change that fashion outlines for us.

I have had occasion to point out above that the *tempo* of fashion depends upon the loss of sensibility to nervous incitements which are formed by the individual disposition. The latter changes with the ages, and combines with the form of the objects in an inextricable mutual influence. We find here also one of the deep relations which we thought to have discovered between the classical and the "natural" composition of things. The conception of what is included in the term natural is rather vague and misleading, for as a rule it is merely an expression of value, which is employed to grace values prized for different reasons, and which has therefore been uniformly supported by the most antagonistic elements. At the same time, we may limit the term "natural" from a negative standpoint by a process of exclusion, inasmuch as certain forms, impulses and conceptions can certainly lay no claim to the term; and these are the forms that succumb most rapidly to the changes of fashion, because they lack that relation to the fixed centre of things and of life which justifies the claim to permanent existence. Thus Elizabeth Charlotte of the Palatinate, a sister-in-law of Louis XIV, exceedingly masculine in her ways, inspired the fashion at the French Court of women acting like men and being addressed as such, whereas the men conducted themselves like women. It is self-evident that such behavior can be countenanced by fashion only because it is far removed from that never-absent substance of human relations to which the form of life must eventually return in some way, shape, or manner. We cannot claim that all fashion is unnatural, because the existence of fashion itself seems perfectly

natural to us as social beings, yet we can say, conversely, that absolutely unnatural forms may at least for a time bear the stamp of fashion.

To sum up, the peculiarly piquant and suggestive attraction of fashion lies in the contrast between its extensive, all-embracing distribution and its rapid and complete disintegration; and with the latter of these characteristics the apparent claim to permanent acceptance again stands in contrast. Furthermore, fashion depends no less upon the narrow distinctions it draws for a given circle, the intimate connection of which it expresses in the terms of both cause and effect, than it does upon the decisiveness with which it separates the given circle from others. And, finally, fashion is based on adoption by a social set, which demands mutual imitation from its members and thereby releases the individual of all responsibility—ethical and æsthetic—as well as of the possibility of producing within these limits individual accentuation and original shading of the elements of fashion. Thus fashion is shown to be an objective characteristic grouping upon equal terms by social expediency of the antagonistic tendencies of life.

JAMES A. McNEIL WHISTLER

HARPER PENNINGTON

WITH a rare opportunity to tell something of value to all artists and of interest to the world at large, the author of "Whistler as I Knew Him"¹ has collected the trivial gossip of "once upon a time," a lot of more than dubious stories which he must have heard long ago, apparently at second hand, and printed them on better paper than they deserve. Nobody who knew Whistler can believe them, and for the general public they serve chiefly to exhibit Mr. Menpes in a pitiable light. Of what Whistler really taught him he says very little, unfortunately, because it would have been of value. Mr. Menpes has written the "Exaggerated Whistler." The reader, moreover, is confused by the author's conflicting statements. He says on one page that he and Stickert were the only pupils, and on another mentions the anonymous "pupil" who acted as assistant in decorating the "Peacock Room." He tells how Whistler knew only one song, "His Heart Was True to Poll," and apparently only a few notes of that; but he makes him enter an exhibition humming a "French chanson." In the following paragraph the name of M. Degas is printed and reprinted as "Digars": "At one time we were influenced by the work of another artist, Digars; but of course this was kept from the Master. It was Walter Stickert who first saw Digars' work. He brought enthusiastic descriptions of ballet girls Digars was painting in Paris. We tried to combine the methods of Whistler and Digars, and the result was low-toned ballet girls." This is not a typographical error, and shows that Mr. Menpes has not been informed of M. Degas's high position as a painter. It is unfortunate that the author did not limit himself to describing the pictures and etchings which he has reproduced so well, and telling what he knows of them—when, where and how they came into existence.

Whistler never objected to anyone trying to copy his way of painting or etching. His final casting out of Mr. Menpes was because of the latter's assertion, in print, that he was the originator of certain things. Whistler looked upon the filching of ideas as grand larceny. Stealing his purse or even a valuable proof he would have considered petty theft. We all know the story of his saying to Oscar Wilde (who repeated every good thing he could pick up from "Jimmy's" brilliant talk), when Wilde regretted not having made a certain witty speech—"Never mind, Oscar, you *will*!" And this was quite *sans rancune*—without rancour.

¹ "Whistler as I Knew Him," by Mortimer Menpes: The Macmillan Co., 1904.

Of Mr. Menpes's own work, all that I have seen, including the portraits in this volume, was done from or over photographs. Mr. Menpes is a good photographer and has a good deal of mechanical cleverness; he uses all sorts of tricks and short cuts in his work, each of them very evident to a trained painter. Whistler found this mechanical talent very useful when it came to printing etchings and lithographs; very early, even unique, proofs of these Mr. Menpes is fortunate enough to possess. Whistler used to say that "it was easy to make a collection of etchings if one stood by the press."

The admirable part of the volume issued by Mr. Menpes is the pictorial one, to which very high praise is certainly due, and most cheerfully accorded here. The reprints and facsimiles of themselves make an interesting volume, very many of the reproductions being admirable, and the whole collection fairly represents Whistler's smaller work. A few of the plates fail to express the quality most sought for and insisted upon by "The Master," as Mr. Menpes calls him. For instance, the "Nocturnes," facing pages 36 and 150, do not represent the original paintings in any way. On the other hand, "Moreby Hall" (page 54), gives one a very good idea of how water-color was treated by Whistler. One is able to see and understand from the successive proofs of a single plate the infinite pains "The Master" took with even his seemingly slight drawings. Mr. Canfield tells of having counted sixteen different backgrounds painted in his own small portrait, and heaven knows how many more that were not counted. Mr. Menpes seems ignorant of Whistler's early training; the two years at West Point, where he was at the head of his drawing classes; the work on hydrographical maps; the study in France, in the later fifties, just when the new men in landscape were battling with academic stodginess; the searching out of technique in the pictures gathered together in the Louvre, etc., etc.

"Industry is not a virtue, it is a necessity," wrote the author of the "Ten O'clock," a maxim that cannot be repeated too often. It was industry that made Whistler what he was, technically. His hand and his eye were always in training. The latter was keen to see the balance of line and color, the tone and values of whatever it looked at. Still, many persons feel that all this was not yet enough to produce the best representation of a human being, behind whose face glows individual intelligence. We are seldom interested in the personality of Whistler's sitters. Now and then, when for a special reason the personage to be portrayed impressed the painter strongly (as in the case of his mother, Carlyle and Sarasate), something more than the mere mask is evident in the faces. Real expression creeps into the representation; but, for the most part, a dummy with a

life-like waxen face and real hair would have done as well as a living model in such portraits as that of "A Girl in a White Dress." For this painter was not concerned with the *mind* of his sitter. He never painted a smile or a frown; indeed, he was not a portrait painter at all, although he sometimes painted portraits. His own personality was too dominant; his interest too absorbed by questions of values, tone, line and color to leave much for facial expression. His figures are not always quite alive, somehow; and for that reason Whistler is not a portrait painter.

Let it be remembered that when he came to London, fresh from the modernity and enthusiasm of the Frenchmen who believed in Corot and Rousseau, he found all England in the possession of such men as Sir Edwin Landseer and Frith, engravings of whose pictures swarmed over the land. One could not escape "the Derby Day" or "There's Life in the Old Dog Yet." Winterhalter was painting sugary royal portraits, and the story-telling picture was at the height of its popularity. The real qualities of good painting were forgotten, or smothered under the narrative of a composition. It was against this false idea of picture-making that Whistler began a revolt of the most determined sort. He tried to disentangle the arts which had become so strangely jumbled together, separating literature from painting and treating the latter from a purely decorative point of view. From what sources he drew inspiration and knowledge it is easy to guess. Indeed, his work shows how he was affected by the fine Japanese *kakemonos* that began to come over seas to us and the wonderful prints of the same people. Then, too, the *Tanagra* figurines gave him hints which he was quick to understand and follow. All this he was doing alone, unaided by so much as the sympathy of his brush-brothers. He fought his battle single-handed and to a victorious finish.

There is too much unthinking praise given to Whistler's work just now; too much hysterical outcry for the highest possible pedestal on which to place him in the Temple of Fame. He was, truly, an artist of the first class, a purifier who lopped off and threw away parasitic excrescences under which the natural blossoms of the painter's art were being crushed out of sight. He was so radical in this that perhaps he went slightly towards the other extreme at times, showing us *only* decorative qualities, to the neglect of quite permissible human interest. When he painted a living creature, it was seldom occupied with anything, never interested, itself, in being alive. It seems strange that Whistler appeared to miss, in the masters whose work he admired: in Tintoretto and Velasquez; the obvious vitality of their men and women.

Whistler painted slowly and laboriously. The placing of his color on

the canvas was difficult for him. He had a maxim, that "the first touch is always the best," which explains, to a painter, much of his technical originality. As a consequence of this idea, every stroke of the brush was most carefully considered before it was made, and changed with great pains and reluctance, if a change became necessary.

Little by little, as Whistler found that he could not count on the help of his fellow-painters, most of whom dreaded the critics and cowered under the lifted lash of Mr. Ruskin, he stood on his defense, quietly at first, and then defiantly, coming out later on to attack in his turn those who had assailed him. The number of his sympathizers was small, even among artists; the public looked upon his work as a joke, receiving it with loud guffaws, when the exhibition committees consented to hang it at all. No doubt there was some exaggeration of speech, some slight differentiation of clothing, hair-dressing and such minor matters. The stories told by Mr. Menpes about the tailor and the barber are absurd. A certain trigness, smartness—acquired, very likely, at West Point, where the cadets change their white duck trousers several times a day—induced "the Master" to take proper care with the fit of his coats. If the vital question as to whether he or Mr. Chase first wore a flat-brimmed top hat is worth settling, Whistler certainly bears off the palm, as Mr. Menpes would have known had he ever seen the "chimney-pots" of '54, probably "sporting" by Whistler before Mr. Chase was out of jackets. It is just possible that Whistler did not wear a "topper" at all in his youth, but had he done so the hat must have had a flat brim, for the simple reason that all high hats were made that way in those days. So Whistler merely reverted to his earliest "tile" when he "copied" Mr. Chase.

Manners "the Master" had, and perhaps, a little manner, too. He was obliged to assert himself, to step along his path jauntily, showing a brave front, in order not to be stamped upon. He constantly asserted that his art was gay and exhilarating, and as constantly held that the sweat of one's brow should not appear, much less be insisted upon, in the painting—not in the least a new idea, only one forgotten by the academicians of his youthful days.

That Whistler was impatient of criticism was perfectly natural. He found that most persons utterly failed to see the aim of his work, sometimes praising him "for qualities which the painter would blush to possess," sometimes heaping unmerited blame on admirable achievements.

As in the case of every innovator, there were "followers" and disciples, of course. To these the "Master" held forth, now instilling a principle of art, now relating an encounter with this or that critic. Mr. Menpes

speaks quite truthfully when he says that Whistler never told "objectionable" stories. I, too, was lucky enough to lunch and dine with Whistler very often, but cannot remember ever seeing Mr. Menpes at those little feasts. Perhaps when Mr. Menpes was a guest things were different, but I fail to recognize the Tite Street Sunday lunches in his description. As to "the Master's" knowledge of wine, it was very limited indeed. I have seen him mistake a famous and rather heavy vintage of champagne for "Tisane." I never saw him cook anything, even in his poorest days, in Venice, but I know that he liked a good dinner at a club, even when it was punctually served and consisted of quite ordinary delicacies such as other men delight in. If it is true that he allowed his omelettes to stand an hour or so waiting for him to finish a lecture on matters and things in general, as described by Mr. Menpes, why, then, "the Master" was certainly *not* the gourmet his Boswell would have us believe. As far as his means would allow, Whistler cultivated daintiness in all things. He furnished his rooms to suit himself. His great activity prevented him from lounging at any time, but the chief reason for his not having comfortable chairs in his studio was to prevent others from making it a loafing-place. It was his *work-room*, in which he was always on his feet, and because he walked up and down before the canvas he was painting, he did not wish to have his beat encumbered. It is also true that before Whistler married he did not have a piano in his house, but when Mrs. Whistler, who played charmingly upon that instrument, came to preside over his establishment, her piano came also. Perhaps it had straight legs—all pianos do not run to curly ones.

To turn again from trivialities, Whistler was in no way "apt to teach." He did not desire to do so. If one asked him a direct question concerning his methods of painting or etching, he would give a simple answer, with all the information he was able to impart couched in the plainest words. How much or how little he knew of the chemistry of pigments, I cannot say. He sometimes tried experiments with different mediums in oil painting. At one time he used benzine to thin the colors; at another, kerosene. I have seen him cover a large canvas all over with the latter in order to bring out the dried tints before he started to repaint or overpaint.

The particular point that was of great interest to him was an exactitude of tone. He painted figures, indoors, so low in tone that he could have added a streak of sunshine at its proper value to the picture. It is questionable whether or no he was right in this. If his darkest canvases grow darker still with age, they will be almost indistinguishable. It is much easier to make a picture harmonious in a low key than in a high one. The "Girl in a White Dress" proves that Whistler was master of the

latter also. If he chose low tones it was from a conviction that they more truly represented what we really see than do color schemes which exhaust the resources of the palette. He pointed out more than once, while walking in the streets, the loss of light in even such an exposed situation as a Regent Street shop-window. . . . a valuable lesson for youngsters to learn, if they can profit by it. Like any other truth, however, this may be pushed too far—until it falls into mere blackness at the last. Whenever we attempt to represent *light*, painting must be a series of compromises and conventions. To pretend that we can approach the true “value” of a candle’s flame in the scale of color limited by pigments applied to canvas is, scientifically, nonsense. For a *source* of light cannot be adequately matched in tone by any *reflection* from an unpolished surface. We make our little conventions, just as they do on the stage, saying to each other, “When you see such and such a patch of color you will please to understand that it is intended to represent the shining sun,” etc. In our Western manner of treating these things we forever run into the danger of forgetting the decorative side of painting. Our habit of treating plastically whatever we paint increases the difficulty of “keeping a composition together,” as it is called, the difficulty of retaining the synthesis very essential to general harmony. It is certain that the nearer in “values,” lights and shades can be brought, the less danger there is of spottiness—“pulling apart”—in the picture, and the greater chance for harmony. With the Orientals, who avoid chiaroscuro altogether and content themselves with a convention that is only a hint at exact representation, pure decoration rules supreme, with the result that we seldom find them committing vulgarities even when they use the gaudiest of hues. I do not know what Mr. Menpes means, on page forty-one, by “shadows growing out of the mass” in Kyosai’s painting, because I cannot remember to have seen any shadows at all used in good Japanese work. A study of the Japanese shadowless pictures helped Whistler to find himself, I have no doubt. The general public, in ’57, still looked on Chinese and Japanese paintings as more or less grotesque. It took a certain amount of courage to call them beautiful, and very positive, sure, original taste to really find them so. Without a doubt, Whistler’s whole artistic make-up was strongly affected by the Japanese, whose exquisite delicacy appealed very much to his own dainty fastidiousness, so constantly shocked by the Early Victorian interiors of half a century ago.

It does not seem possible that in 1880 a friend of mine bought of an English artist, then in Venice, a beautiful little “Nocturne” by Whistler for 20 lire, but it is a fact. The Englishman had lent the panel to Whistler, and had then reclaimed his property—plus the “Nocturne”! It was

only the panel which was considered of value, not the painting on it. If this thing could happen only twenty-four years ago, fancy what an uphill struggle Whistler had for nearly all his life. How could he be other than fiercely personal with so much of disloyalty around him, and so many dunces to hoot at him and all his works. He grew afraid of those who called themselves his friends and, perhaps too often, turned them into enemies. He required more pairs of hands than the one he was born with to do all the work he had in his brain. He used Mr. Menpes's to print with, and Mr. Menpes's legs to run errands. Others were at his service, too, at different times. Probably "the Master" was rather exacting. It may be that he had an erroneous notion as to what his pupils and followers owed to him and worked them all on the principle of using them as he used himself, forgetting that they required more sleep than he and had not the incentives of coming recognition and acknowledged genius to keep them in spirits.

It was no small thing to face the world, as Whistler did, and say, "You are wrong. You have forgotten the best teaching, lost the good traditions, and are being led out of the path by false guides." At first the man was willing to do his own work quietly, making that his only protest against "The Mitherless Bairn" sort of picture, the painfully elaborated "illustration" always so popular at R. A. exhibitions. Boxall saved his brother academicians the disgrace of rejecting the portrait of Whistler's mother, which was as badly hung as possible, and was spoken of as a painting without color—a "black and white." The bad treatment, the criticism, the half-hearted support of friends and the derision of the general public drove the artist to whatever came handy in the way of retaliation. He had a sharp tongue and nimble wits and used them effectively to defend the right, which he believed to be on his side. Mr. Ruskin's word was law for the timid artists, in England, at that time. Whistler sued the old gentleman for libel after the latter had published an intemperate sentence or two in the "*Fors Clavigera*," and won, with farthing damages. But that was the end of Mr. Ruskin; he had been openly laughed at and the blasphemer had not been blasted by a bolt from heaven.

The incident of the "Peacock Room" was not altogether to Whistler's credit. He might have taken down the fine Cordovan leather instead of painting all over it. Someone protested against the wanton destruction to Whistler himself, long after it had been accomplished. His excuse was that "the leather was ugly" and that "the artist's mission was to destroy what was bad as well as to produce what was good." It seems likely that the room "got away" from him, after he had begun to paint in it. The

final result was original and gorgeous in the extreme, but one cannot help feeling that Mr. Leyland was rather badly treated, after all. Whistler knew perfectly well that his own conduct in that affair was indefensible. Much allowance must be made for his great enthusiasm in the work, but unnecessary destruction of fine old leather is deplorable. It was as though one asked a painter to touch up the frame of a poor picture, dear to one for any reason except merit, and the painter had produced a masterpiece over the features of some friend. To produce a masterpiece is well enough, but it is wiser to take a fresh canvas for it.

Then came a period of dreadful poverty and exile, during which the Venice etchings, paintings and pastels were produced. Whistler's courage never forsook him through all that painful time. He came back to London and Tite Street brimful of energy, ready to produce the mass of exquisite things that came from his clever fingers from 1881 until he died. More and more appreciation of his work was apparent on all sides. The critics began to suspect that he had real talent, even though he used it in, to them, a mystifying way. The constancy with which he struck the same harmonious chords dinned them finally into some very dull ears. To be sure, the same notes were also picked up by smaller men, who repeated them on feeble pipes, a little flat, *ad nauseam*, bringing a certain discredit to their teacher.

Left to do his work, unmolested, Whistler would probably have been a genial companion to most persons. He looked upon all criticism of his pictures as the result of misunderstanding and honestly thought his critics dull of comprehension. He tried to expound his aims in the "Ten O'clock" lecture, forgetting, perhaps, that very much of what is there set down needs explanatory comment for those persons who do not practice the art of painting as a profession. He was content to produce works within the range of his own limitations, all of which he understood better than anybody else. It is hard to say what he might have done if the opportunity had been given him of decorating other rooms besides the "Peacock." He was not the sort of man to reject a set of conditions over which he could not keep control; witness his entire acquiescence in the modern dress of women; he never yearned for a return to Greek draperies or "the fork of two prongs." He was quite modern, himself, and liked the gaiety and sparkle of modern life. The fact of his painting in a low key, as it is called, was partly due to his measuring everything against the brilliant light of day, out of doors, taking white as the highest note of the brightest thing it is *possible* to represent on paper and scaling all other objects and conditions down from that. He may have tried to do away with conventions—it

is hard to say for certain that he had this idea in mind. If he imagined so much positivism to be possible he was mistaken, as far as our Western art is concerned. The purely decorative side of painting, as it is understood by Orientals, sweeps away all realism, all chiaroscuro, and leaves the composition a scientific combination of line and color, irrespective of mere actualities as they appear to our workaday eyes, or are recorded by the camera. The controversy as to which is the better art is, and will be, unending. It is a matter of education, feeling and taste, about which latter, in spite of the Latin proverb, there is more disputation than about anything else, except religion.

THE WORLD AND BRAIN

EDUARD HITZIG

I

IGNORABIMUS! This word, with which the famous Berlin physiologist, Emil du Bois-Reymond, concluded his well-known discourse, "The Bounds of the Knowledge of Nature," has, in almost unprecedented fashion given occasion, during the three decades that have passed since then, to a constant strife of opinions. The train of thought of this investigation emanates from a citation of Laplace, and culminates in the following reflection:

"If a mind which, for a given instant, knew all the forces operative in Nature and the common condition of the beings of which it consists, were, moreover, capacious enough to subject this information to analysis and were thus able to comprise in the same formula the movements of the largest heavenly bodies and of the smallest atom; to such a mind nothing would be uncertain, and the past and the future would flash within its ken. The human understanding, in its achievement within the region of Astronomy, presents a weak copy of such a mind."

"It would be a great triumph if we could say, that during a given mental process a certain movement of atoms would take place in the cells; if we knew how the play of the atoms of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, phosphor, etc., corresponded with the different psychical sensations,—but even though we had this astronomical knowledge of the mental organ, the mental proceedings themselves would be just as incomprehensible as they are now. A complete astronomical knowledge of the brain can show us nothing but moved matter. By no conceivable arrangement or movement of particles of matter are we able to build a bridge into the realm of consciousness."

The comprehensive literature, which has had its starting-point in this discourse, especially in its "Ignorabimus," or has busied itself with it, gives evidence of the powerful and intelligible interest which the world problem, that was at once brought to the centre of the horizon, and its interpretation, have excited and still excite. We look now at the two weightiest objections.

Some regarded it as foolhardy to ascribe to the advance of scientific investigation a seemingly arbitrary boundary. Indeed, very recent years have produced such an abundance of unexpected scientific discoveries that it might well be asked in despair whether any bounds at all could be ascribed

to the knowledge of Nature. Du Bois-Reymond himself would probably have repaid with a mocking smile anyone who had predicted that men would one day telegraph hundreds of miles without wire upon the Morse apparatus, that the living human heart would be photographed, and that in radium would be discovered a substance whose properties would threaten to shake the most firmly established laws of Nature. But if we look a little closer, we see that all these discoveries fall well within the compass of the knowledge which is conceded by du Bois-Reymond to the mind, indeed that they are far from completing it. In the face of objections of this sort du Bois-Reymond was consequently right in resolutely clinging (in his monograph, "The Seven Riddles of the World," 1880) to the position which earlier he had taken. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the original discussion was whether the human power to have any knowledge of Nature outside of this compass, should be limited or not.

The second objection emanated from a totally different assumption. While the authorities above mentioned wished only not to see denied to *the future* the possibility that the human brain,—whether it be the same as at present, or of a higher stage of development,—may at length learn to understand the ostensibly incomprehensible, another school maintains that it is *even now* in possession of this knowledge. We take as representative of this school Professor Haeckel of Jena, because he has recently brought together in his book, "The Riddles of the World," all his earlier researches and opinions, which tend to establish this view, in connection with the various investigations and theories of others. If the contents and form of this book, which treats of the highest problems of human knowledge, gave marked occasion for criticism, such lies very far from our present purpose. Our interest therein is confined to the discussion of the question whether the author has succeeded in proving that he has really comprehended the ostensibly incomprehensible, that he has perceived that the human brain is consequently even now capable of perceiving how consciousness arises out of the movement of the atom and the activity of the cells of the brain.

Through all the writings of Haeckel up to this time, there runs, like a red thread, the endeavor to bring proof of the correctness of monistic-panteism and of the incorrectness of the dualistic-theistic conception of the world. He consequently seeks to prove that there is neither a God nor an immortal soul nor freedom of will, but that the whole of Nature to its last atom is so animated that every occurrence in the universe may be explained through the working upon one another of the forces of an animated eternal and (in respect to its mass) unchangeable matter. From this point of view, he reproaches du Bois Reymond with having proclaimed himself with his

"Ignorabimus," an adherent of the dualistic conception of the world and with thereby furnishing the representatives of this doctrine with pernicious weapons against the freedom and the progress of science. We are not interested by the negative part of this demonstration, which seeks to prove that neither the Bible nor any other religion is able to support a belief in God. The positive part is concerned with the whole of natural science, from paleontology, the science of those great archives of our remote antiquity, that were established millions of years ago, to cosmogony, the science of the nature and origin of the universe. As a result of the teaching of Lamarck and Darwin, all plants and beasts now living are regarded as products of development out of the very simplest to more and more complicated forms, and in such fashion that the multiplicity of these forms is explained by the adjustment of their members to present conditions of existence, tellurian, atmospheric, climatic, and to their continuous development through natural selection and heredity.

Within this very field of investigation biological science has celebrated its highest triumphs. In the palaeontological remains has been preserved a great number of skeletons of extinct vertebrate animals. If one follows these creatures which have arisen during successive geological periods of millions of years, and compares them with animals now existent, one cannot wholly close his eyes to the conviction that man is only a member in this evolution. A member of the family of Primates, he is, in body, no further separated from the other members of this class, the apes, than are the lowest grade of this class, the West-apes, from the East-apes, the gorilla, the chimpanzee, and the missing link (claimed to have been found), the *Pithecanthropus erectus*, who most closely resemble man. In spiritual relations it is perhaps otherwise. The monists of strictest observance can only see in the human soul a quantitatively higher developed animal soul. One can, however, entertain another opinion, and, without leaving the ground upon which monism has grown up, one may discover in the psychical utterances of man something different in *QUALITY*.

While palaeontology furnishes sufficient material for tracing the family history (phylogeny) of man in an almost unbroken succession to the lowest vertebrates, it does not carry beyond. The earth's strata have preserved practically no remains of invertebrates, and cannot preserve them. We find, however, adequate compensation in the comparative study of the still extant forms of life, in the study of their family history, and of the development of the single individual (ontogeny). We learn with the aid of the microscope how the simplest unicellular forms of animal life, representing the transition to the vegetable kingdom, have slowly but steadily developed,

forming at first only more cells, then creatures containing the beginnings of organs and systems. The development of man from the fertilized egg-cell reveals to us a similar progress. In the measure in which the development of the single species advances to a higher grade, we recognize also a graduated development of the elementary constituents and organs of the single individual. For example, we meet with the simplest form of muscular fibre, already in the *Infusoria*, in the stem of the *Vorticella*, where out of the tissue-forming fluid (*plasma*) contractile threads are formed. A further development of this structure appears in the lower and higher invertebrates (*e.g.*, *Polypi*), in this respect, that such threads in increased number lie parallel to one another and assume the form of smooth muscle-fibres. While these forms of organized contractile substance also appear in vertebrates, in the organs of involuntary movement (gut, blood-vessels, etc.), here voluntary movement imposes upon the highest forms of organization of this substance cross-striped muscle-fibres. All these structures possess, however, the fundamental property of contracting lengthwise and of thus serving according to their natures the locally and individually different needs of movement.

Likewise we observe the organs which serve for the expulsion of gases adapting themselves to the tasks established by individual development and by the determining conditions of life. The function of our lungs is performed in the lowest organisms through the permeable cell-membrane or through the additional outer (skin-breathing) cover. In the case of more highly organized invertebrates (*e.g.*, insects), numerous air-tubes (*tracheæ*) sink through the skin into the body of the animal; in the case of fishes there are gills, supplied with numerous capillary blood-vessels (the gills take up the oxygen of the water); and in the case of amphibians, lungs and gills share in this occupation according as the creature stays in the air or water.

Most instructive, perhaps, is the gradual evolution of the organs of sense, which affords communication with the attractions of the outside world. In the lowest and sightless animals the cell-forming and supporting fluid (*protoplasm*) of the outer covering is itself sensitive to light. If one exposes a great number of them to irradiation, they collect, according to the peculiarity of their reaction against the light, either at the brightest or darkest point of their reservoir (positive or negative heliotaxis). Later are developed the first beginnings of the complicated optical apparatus, which as an eye is inclosed in a skin-cleft of the human face, simple spots of pigment upon the skin, which now assume unaided the functions of sensitiveness to light and of that reaction against light, which is necessary

for the support of the individual. Indeed, in certain species of snakes, different parts of the eye begin to develop a sight-apparatus equipped with nerves and connected with a nervous central organ; this apparatus gradually matures, in the higher classes of animals, to the perfection of the human eye.

Just as the members of the lowest classes of animals react, without the mediation of the nerves, against light, so they also act against the physical and chemical attractions that affect the surface of the body or the inner coating of its hollows. By degrees the beginnings of a nervous system make their appearance in the form of ganglia, which lie in the outer covering and are bound by nerve-fibres into a system, and which regulate the movements that respond to inner and outer attractions. In the case of higher development, these fibres and cells take the form of structures lying like rope-ladders in the longitudinal axis of the animal; at the head-end of these structures appear frequently great collections of nerve-cells in the form of esophageal ganglia, which can unite into esophageal rings. In them we recognize already the first beginnings of localized brain-activity: for example, the piercing of the supra-esophageal ganglion, which is similar to the brain, destroys spontaneous progressive movements, while the piercing of the infra-esophageal ganglion does not cause this effect.

In vertebrates—also in the human foetus—there is formed out of a caniculated furrow in the embryonic foundation of the outer covering the medullary tube, whose head-end gradually expands for the reception of the brain, which, in the gradation of animals, becomes steadily greater and more complicated.

With this development of the nervous system, its functions, which are distributed over the whole surface of the skin—sensual attraction, progress, reception of nourishment—draw constantly together into centrally connected nerve-masses, and in these advance with progressive evolution steadily towards the head-end, so that here finally, in the forming of the cerebrum, arises an organ which brings about the origin of the phenomena of consciousness and of the so-called voluntary movements. At the same time the nervous structures which arise out of the earlier grades of evolution retain their influence upon the involuntary, especially the automatic, movements of the intestines.

The sum of these facts explains the evolution of all those species which are characterized by the unity of their organs, including the natural and conquering development of man by adaptation, progress, and heredity, so that the dragging in of another unknown and, in this case, supernatural cause seems, according to the universal laws of thought, not only unneces-

sary but inadmissible. This reason suffices so that we may abstain from the enumeration of the other reasons which tell against the religious doctrine of the six days of creation. But in any case the question, whether at the beginning of all things a creation in a higher sense did not take place, is in no way answered.

From these experiences it inevitably arises that the sum of life-appearances, which we are accustomed to call "soul," is not peculiar to man, but is likewise the product of progressive evolution. But if the human soul is thus derived and is most closely related to the animal soul, it is, for this reason, impossible to maintain the belief in its immortality. On the whole, everything that we know of the functions of the soul seems inseparably connected with the nervous system, especially with the brain and its bodily condition. The new-born child, as well as an abortion without a cerebrum, displays signs of sensitiveness to pleasure and pain; but yet we are unable to believe in the existence of a soul, at least in the narrower sense, in either the one or the other:—in the one because the cerebrum is wholly lacking, in the other because the nervous ties which connect its several parts with one another and with the subordinated organs of the central nervous system, are, in the first months after birth, not sufficiently matured to render possible the co-operation of all these parts of the organs of the soul. Likewise the soul seems set aside during deep, dreamless, natural sleep, or during narcosis. Feverish conditions and those functional or organic changes which are inseparably connected with mental disturbances, cause all that we are able to perceive concerning the functions of the soul to be violently changed. Indeed, there are forms of apathetic imbecility in which nothing can be perceived of the existence of a soul. We cannot, therefore, believe in a kind of soul that existed before its material substratum, the brain, and when released from it could longer exist.

Upon these facts, their inner relation and the convictions necessarily arising out of them, all scientifically trained investigators and philosophers are agreed. Beyond these facts, however, the greatest differences of opinion prevail, not only over the conception of the soul, or what the particular scholar chooses to call "soul," but also over the extension of the life of the soul and the single characteristics ascribed to the soul.

We present here briefly the views of Haeckel, and we can and must, according to the purpose of this essay, confine ourselves to their presentation and hurried elucidation, because this investigator has derived the most comprehensive results out of those fundamental ideas of monism, which are shared by a large circle of scholars, who in other things hold widely differing views.

According to Haeckel, the whole universe is dowered with a soul (*Panpsychismus*). The phenomena of life, which we perceive in unicellular animals (*Protista*), are utterances of their sensation and will, their soul. This soul is, however, nothing else than the form of energy of a soul-substance—that is, of a fixed part of the cell-plasm of this lowest animal. The same presentation is then employed for the more highly developed grades of animals, and indeed in such fashion that, in those animals which consist of heaps of cells, one has to distinguish near the single cell-souls a common soul (cœnobial soul), and likewise in the tissues consisting of numerous cells, a tissue-soul. In the higher animals the “soul-matter” forms a part of the nervous system. In the lower groups (*e.g.*, algæ and sponges) all the cells of the body are symmetrical (all, with small differences, sharing in the soul-life); in the higher groups, on the other hand, in accordance with the laws of the division of labor, only a select portion of these are the “soul-cells.”

The origin of the human soul is set forth, not as an hypothesis, but as a firmly established fact, in the following manner: The masculine seed-cells (*spermatozoa*) and the feminine egg-cells possess a cell-soul like that of the *Protista*: they possess also sensation and movement. When the millions of seed-cells contained in a masculine discharge of semen meet the feminine egg, then a seed-cell penetrates into the egg-cell. The reason of this penetration, which, in the sense of romantic-love, may be designated as sexual cell-love, consists in a chemical activity of the plasma that is related to smell or taste. At the meeting of the two cell-germs, both souls melt into a single one, the beginning of the soul of the man that is to be. At the moment of the penetration of the seed-cell into the egg-cell, this secretes a thin mucous layer, which prevents the pressing in of other masculine cells. But if, through cold or poison, it is rendered “unconscious,” the forming of the mucous layer ceases and numerous seed-cells press into the body. From these processes it is inferred that in both cells there exists a specific, sentient, living sensation.

Moreover, Haeckel ascribes the possession of a soul, therefore of sensation and will, not only to the individuals of the animal kingdom and to their constituent parts, the cells or the plasm, but he finds the same psychological attributes in plants, indeed even in the atoms of inorganic nature and consequently in the two chief elements of unorganized matter, mass and ether. These are not dead and only movable through our forces, but they possess sensation and volition (naturally of the lowest grade); they experience pleasure in condensation, pain in expansion; they strive after the first and fight against the second. Therefore a will which arises out of sensations dwells

in these atoms. These sensations find expression, for example, in the chemical relations which the atoms of the single elements and the bodies thus formed enter into with one another. "All degrees of inclination, from perfect indifference up to the strongest passion, are found in the chemical relation of the single elements to one another; in just such wise as they play the greatest rôle in the psychology of man and especially in the inclination of both sexes." The irresistible passion which drove Paris to Helen is the same "unconscious force of attraction which in the impregnation of animal and vegetable eggs impels the living thread of sperm to penetrate into the egg-cell, the same powerful movement by which two atoms of hydrogen and one of oxygen unite to form a single molecule of water."

While certain scholars identify consciousness and psychical activity—let it be said by way of parenthesis that to many of them consciousness, conception, and appreciation, *ego* and will, are synonymous—Haeckel, now at least, regards the consciousness as an especial form or quality of the psychical processes. These extend, as we have seen, to the whole universe and all its atoms; while consciousness, according to Haeckel's present view, falls to the lot of only the higher animals and is combined with the centralization of the nervous system, highly developed organs of sense, and a widely extended association of groups of ideas. Especially important for the understanding of Haeckel's conception of the world is the knowledge that he originally ascribed consciousness even to the lowest animal-forms, the unicellular Protista, and that he has only recently been converted by the works of Verworn to his present more conservative opinion.

It cannot be denied that this form of the conception of the world has produced the extreme consequences of monism; and moreover, the unprecedented sale of Haeckel's "*Welträthsel*" ("Riddles of the World") seems to show that the seekers after causality are temporarily satisfied by this solution of the highest problems of human thought. His view, however, might well seem less adapted to that circle of readers which is accustomed to independent scientific thought and to sober analysis and valuation of whatever, in its own conceptions and in those of others, consists of demonstrable facts or of undemonstrable hypotheses. Only from this scientific point of view and only for the purpose already mentioned, do we cast a critical light upon the train of thought that we have just presented. Philosophical discussions, in the narrower sense, are far from our purpose.

The first and foremost question may be thus formulated: Has it been proved, or at least brought within the degree of probability attainable in the investigation of scientific problems, that the natural phenomena which our senses perceive in the universe—if not these in their totality, at least

all phenomena of life in organized substances—may be traced back to the psychical activity of matter? Were this so, it would perhaps be declared that the first step on the way to the knowledge of the origin of consciousness had been taken.

At the first glance the positive answer to at least the second part of this question seems extraordinarily attractive. The psychical phenomena of my own personality, which, I know, is equipped with a brain and with a developed nervous system, are known to me. If, now, I observe in those creatures, which stand close to man in the development of their nervous system and in other respects, the externally perceptible signs of those phenomena of life that, according to my observation of self are the results of fixed psychical processes, then the inference is justified that the phenomena have arisen out of analogous psychical processes of these animals and of myself. From the mimicry and the other movements of a monkey at the sight and the consumption of a fig, and of a dog at the sight and the consumption of a piece of meat, we conclude, with apparently the greatest probability, that analogous sensations of pleasure and processes of the will arising from these take place under analogous circumstances in these animals as in ourselves. If we follow the succession of animals further down, even to most remote members, the same spectacle always recurs; first of all sensory organs and a central nervous system are found; and there follow always upon sensual attractions, and when these are wanting, upon the attractions of the outer world, proportionate responsive movements, which must be explained as movements of approach for the purpose of satisfying the instinct of nutrition and other instincts, or as movements of flight resulting from the instinct of self-defense. Because we have to do with life-processes, that are quite gradually simplifying themselves, we might seem warranted in postulating (in the case of all these animals, and also, as a necessary development of this idea, in the case of plants) fragments of pleasure—and pain—sensations, and a therefrom resulting will with its motorial effects. And because even the single cells—not only the procreative cells—exhibit, according to fixed law, the phenomena of life and movement, it would seem only consistent to ascribe to them likewise psychical attributes, therefore a cell-soul.

Before we discuss this doctrine from a general point of view, we wish to prove its demonstrative force by a concrete example. We select for that purpose the union of the sex-cells, which has been discussed by Haeckel at great length.

In the process of fertilization it is recognized as a fact, that a seed-cell penetrates into the egg-cell and that this then secretes a membrane which

prevents the penetration of further seed-cells. And, in the hands of Haeckel, what becomes of these facts, simple in themselves, by the addition of a fantastic superstructure?

The cell-souls love one another, sexually. This love, which appears among sensations similar to taste or smell, is the cause of the act of the will which produces copulation. Now, at the very outset arises the question whether convincing proofs exist for the belief that individuals—no matter whether unicellular or multicellular—which possess neither sense-organs nor a centralized nervous system are capable of receiving sensations and developing them into feelings of love. No proofs of the sort exist, and if such functions—be it only in their lowest grade of development—be ascribed to the plasm, this is, after all, only an hypothesis. We need hypotheses only for the explanation of those processes which cannot be convincingly explained on the ground of other known experiences; and the process of fertilization is thoroughly open to such an explanation.

The feminine egg, especially that of the sea-urchin, in which the above-described processes of fertilization have been studied by Hertwig, shares, in many respects, like properties with another group of cells, the so-called phagocytes (eating cells), colorless blood-corpuscles, lymph-cells, etc. The phagocytes receive into themselves other bodies which come into their neighborhood, although they may or may not be capable of movement of their own like the spermatozoa. To the first group belong, for example, numerous bacteria; to the second, all kinds of structures of organic and indeed of inorganic origin; for example, granules of fat out of ruined tissues, red blood-corpuscles, fragments of insect-hairs, all kinds of granular dyes, even the heavy cinnabar. This process appears entirely analogous to the process of fertilization, without its occurring to any one to seek behind it the working of sensual or other sensations and feelings as motives of an act of volition; one rather explains these processes on purely physical grounds. It is not known to me, whether the egg is likewise enabled to receive into itself all such bodies, or whether the spermatozoon is enabled to penetrate into the phagocytes. Were the latter the case, which I regard as very probable, Haeckel's train of thought would naturally lead us to ascribe to the cell-soul of the spermatozoon, for example, of the sea-urchin a perverse sexual impulse.

Not less simply are explained the forming of the cell-membrane in the fertilized normal egg-cell and the omission of this formation in the poisoned egg-cell, without having recourse to a belief in the presence or absence of a kind of will and therewith to speak of the "unconsciousness" of the narcotized cell. (Probably this imputation of "unconsciousness" originates

in the time when Haeckel ascribed consciousness to all normal unicellular structures.) Surely these phenomena may be explained by the principles of Darwinism which Haeckel himself employed with entire correctness.

At the moment in which the spermatozoon penetrates into the egg-cell, the evolution of the future individual begins, and indeed through the development of the cell-membrane. Now probably there have always been, just as there are to-day, egg-cells of very different kinetic energy. The more weakly endowed individuals of this sort, who therefore produced more slowly their protecting covers, could generate no posterity capable of life, because they fell victims to over-fertilization. So it is understood on the one hand that the rapid formation of the protecting membrane has become gradually a widely spread attribute of the egg-cell, and, on the other hand, that the egg-cell, which has been hindered in its change of matter by poison or cold, lacks this ability.

Apart from this, Haeckel moves in the strongest contradiction to his own theories when he ascribes souls to sexual cells. The psychical function is, according to him, in the case of the lower animals either an attribute of the single cells or a product of all the cells composing their body; in the case of the higher animals, however, in accordance with the law of the division of labor, it is an attribute of only a selected part of these, the "soul-cells." Of the vertebrates, all cells of the central nervous system are not soul-cells, but only a part of them. Now, it may be asked how it is consistent with this tenet that every man and every woman carry about with them in their reproductive organs millions of cell souls.

At the bottom of the train of thought, which we have placed at the head of this critical discussion, lies an error easily escaping superficial observation. It consists in this, that here, offhand, all the processes of life, indeed, one can rightly say, all the processes of movement in the universe, are conceived as psychical processes and are identified with them, while it ought first to be proved that these conceptions are identical. If we can, in this connection, speak at all of proof, it consists of countless analogical inferences, built upon one another, each one of which has smaller probative value than its predecessor. This error in the fundamental view is further increased by a faulty definition of the soul, when it is said that the cell-soul is the sum of the tonic forces which are bound to the plasm and inseparably connected with it. Psychical processes can, doubtless, be described themselves so that accompanying forces are at the same time bound or free; but therein it is neither proved nor indeed rendered probable, that these forces, or a certain sum of them, are identical with any psychical process. Were this definition correct, it ought to be not only applicable to the soul in

general and consequently to the soul of all the higher animals, but it ought also to be so exclusive that one could not understand thereby, with equal correctness, any object. The definition meets neither condition.

If we follow this error further, we find its beginnings in the imputation, which runs through the whole demonstration, namely, that the soul which clings to every atom of the substance of the universe is presented as composed of sensation and movement. The existence of movement we can prove, the existence of sensation is not proved and not provable; only this is said in proof, that the one is not intelligible without the other. But it is not absolutely necessary that we should understand the final reason of everything. Were the reverse true, there would be no world-riddles at all.

We are acquainted with countless forms of movement, both of inorganic and of organized substance, behind which it is impossible, without putting a constraint upon things, to find the influence of a sensation. If this, however, happens, then there lies under this a confusion in the idea of sensitiveness—for example, sensitiveness to light and susceptibility—with sensation. If light changes the silver salt of the photographic plate or stirs the protoplasm of the plant to the production of the green chlorophyl, we do not know how one, by summoning every art, could discover behind this the motive of a sensation. If the motorial nerves of a frog-preparation are stimulated by electrical, chemical, thermal or mechanical means, then the peroneal muscle, which is dominated by these nerves, draws itself together; the movement *par excellence*, the muscle-movement, enters into the process. Cell-souls, in vertebrates, according to Haeckel, have withdrawn into the soul-cells of the central nervous system, and yet one can arrange things as one wishes and not be able to understand how the cells of a frog's peroneal muscle, which has been released from the central nervous system, could arrive at a sensation.

Meantime those simplest forms of movement (which have perhaps been the chief causes of misleading men to the assumption that voluntary movement, with sensation as its motive, is found in the simplest organisms), the protoplasmic movements (*amoeboid*) of cells and of unicellular individuals, have been successfully imitated by art and thereby have been made intelligible through such simple physical laws as we have considered in the case of the penetration of foreign bodies into phagocytes. If a drop of oil is suspended in a fluid, it stretches out continuations to that side from which a solution of soda is made to flow (Quincke). If a drop of quicksilver is brought upon a glass plate into a solution of diluted nitric acid, in which there is a crystal of bichromate of potassium, the drop moves in various amœboid movements upon this crystal (Bernstein). These processes of

movement are simply explained by change of surface-tension, and it is not necessary to describe them as desire of the oil-soul for union with the soda-soul, or of the quicksilver-soul with the chrome-soul.

Haeckel's experience with "consciousness" should have made him careful. Consciousness belongs unquestionably to the psychical activities, and Haeckel ought, indeed, to have become convinced that this peculiar phenomenon of life does not, as he originally assumed, fall to the lot of all organized beings, but only to the individuals equipped with a highly organized nervous system. Consciousness and psychical activity are not the same; however, the processes of consciousness are not isolated, but are gradually evolved out of the unconscious activities of the soul; and when they have reached, in the case of men, their highest degree of development, a sharp division of conscious and unconscious activity of souls is not practicable. In this conception, we stand upon the same ground as Haeckel, indeed in certain respects, as will appear later, we go further than he. Yet consciousness, as self-observation knows it, and as universal word-usage and psychology conceive of it, stands opposed to every other psychical phenomenon of nature as something new and singular. This apparent contradiction is explained by the fact that consciousness represents the actual resultant of the coöperation of all the organs which serve psychical functions.

It can admit of no doubt that, just as consciousness develops phylogenetically out of the other activities of the soul, so these psychical processes are formed out of the simple processes of life in such a manner that gradually with the education, perfection, and reproduction of the organs there arises out of the simplest physical and chemical processes of life, that which is broadly understood as psychical activity. We find, therefore, in such a plan a perfect analogue to the evolution of consciousness. But as little as this has been associated with the psychical activity, so little has the conception of the soul or of the psychical activity been associated with a fixed sum of physical and chemical processes. Least of all can one ascribe to these lowest forms of the soul the ability to produce acts of volition which have their motives in sensations and feelings. At all events, we are unable to imagine psychical processes of this sort without a centralized nervous system. The soul, or rather the psychical activity, appears, therefore, as a stage of evolution with easy transitions. The facts, to be presented in the second part of this essay, will reveal a more comprehensive understanding of this view.

We have already seen above that Haeckel, without regard to the apparently extreme consequences, is actually inconsistent in his apportionment of psychical traits to the cells of the human body, because, of its cells,

only the nerve-cells, and these in turn, only the so-called soul-cells, should possess these traits. Now, there exists in the human body a very great nervous system (dominating the most vital functions), which is only loosely connected with the consciousness and is almost wholly withdrawn from the influence of the will, the vegetative nervous system, the system of the vago-sympathetic nerves. This contains no soul-cells and performs its functions, undisturbed, in the deepest sleep, yet it governs an abundance of life-phenomena which far surpass in complexity and efficiency all that we know of the phenomena of life of the lower animals. It might indeed be said that the essential life-phenomena of the lower animal-world, which attain to their highest development in these organs of involuntary and unconscious functions, have continued to the human stage of evolution. The movements of the alimentary canal, of the heart, and of the blood-vessels, the preparation and admission of the chyle, the activity of the numerous systems of glands, the maintenance of the blood in a fixed chemical and morphological composition, the production of poisons and antidotes, etc., are regulated by means of these nerves without the soul's concerning itself therewith or, indeed, being able to concern itself.

If we have now seen that panpsychism neither presents proofs of the general animation of matter nor leads us to a deeper understanding of the soul, the further question arises whether Haeckel's explanations—granted that we could concur in the fundamental views cherished by him—could, in accordance with our formulation of the question, help us to a deeper understanding of consciousness or of its origin out of material processes, as we express ourselves with du Bois-Reymond. Upon this question, which represents the chief riddle of the world, we find very little in the far-ranging views of Haeckel. According to his definition of the conception and content of consciousness—if it indeed be a definition—this is to be regarded as the inner view of all possible phenomena both of the outer world and of our own collective activity of soul, of all perceptions, sensations, and struggles or activities of the will. This is to be compared to a reflection. Likewise, he defines the conception of imagination as the inner picture of the external object, which is conveyed to us through the sensation. The activities of consciousness and those of imagination are therefore—as frequently happens—used here as synonymous. By these words, the nature of the things of this world is not brought closer to our understanding.

An inner view or a reflection presupposes always a subject which views or which observes the image in a mirror, and this is lacking. So we learn of this subject, with which we should like to become acquainted, not only nothing; but it is moved farther from our understanding by the interpola-

tion of a periphrase, a simile. This in itself should not be a reproach; we learn from it as much or as little as if we indicate the sum of the material processes and of the corresponding processes of consciousness as psycho-physical parallelism or psycho-physical correspondence, or as if we avail ourselves of similar circumlocutions. Because the consciousness, or the soul, in the wider sense, is conceivable neither before nor after its bodily organs nor contemporary with them, but separated from them, and, on the contrary, only in reciprocal action with them, our need of causality seeks a causal connection between the two. From beginning to end this is inconceivable. To be sure, we may, with Wundt, define the consciousness as the relation of all the psychical structures, but our understanding of the problem is not advanced. Reproach is accordingly directed only against the effort to delude us into believing that "the bridge into the province of consciousness" has been already built by means of the monistic view of the world, and to proclaim that those who do not believe are heretics.

This problem is as great as the problem of the soul, of the nature of matter and force, and of the beginning of all movement in the universe. Everywhere, with proud self-reliance, the necessity of the explanation of all things through the monistic view of the world is taken for granted, and the most ideal result of these things is found in that pantheism to which every atom of the universe, with the force that is bound to it, seems a part of the eternal God. As has already been said, such a necessity in no way exists.

If we pass to the reason of things, we notice that not one of all the riddles is solved. Haeckel is compelled to acknowledge with resignation, at the close of his observations: "We admit anew that, from the innermost essence of Nature, we stand to-day as unintelligently remote as Anaximander . . . did 2400 years ago; indeed, we must even confess that the real character of the substance becomes constantly more wonderful and enigmatic, the more deeply we penetrate into the knowledge of its attributes, matter and energy. . . . We do not yet know to-day that which lies hidden behind knowable phenomena as 'Thing-in-itself' (Kant)."

But he continues imperturbably: "Yet what matters to us this mysterious 'Thing-in-itself,' if we possess no means for its investigation, and if we do not even clearly know whether or not it exists?"

In other words, monism teaches us just as little of the real nature and the beginning of matter and force, as it helps to an understanding of the phenomena of consciousness. Somewhat otherwise than in du Bois-Reymond appears the outer clothing of these riddles of the world, but this clothing does not contain their solution. This scholar says very cautiously, in his "Seven Riddles of the World," that there is no reason for denying "that

the creating Almighty has equipped matter, from the beginning, with such force that, under proper circumstances on the earth and other heavenly bodies, germs of life ought to arise without assistance." I do not see that, up to the present time, anyone has found such a reason, and I surmise that no one will ever succeed in doing so. Therewith is admitted the possibility, as said above, that a solitary act of creation has taken place, but such a supernatural interference with the destiny of the world has not been proved, and should not have been so stated by du Bois-Reymond. At the end of every method of consideration we therefore come to the incomprehensible, the "Ignorabimus." Because the nature of consciousness and the beginning of all things seem to us equally incomprehensible, we are able to consider these either without an hypothesis or with that of a divine interference (single and solitary though that may have been).

If a part of the activity of our consciousness is closed to study, yet another part affords to research the most profitable object. The happenings of the external world and of our own body may be conceived of as phenomena of movement, which are carried through the senses to our central nervous system and by this are again set into movement.

The second part of this essay shall concern itself with a short survey of the far from exhausted results of these investigations, which will bring us to the very threshold of consciousness.

NOTE.—The author does not attribute to Professor Haeckel all the discoveries enumerated above or ascribe to him the formation of all the pantheistic theories briefly mentioned in this essay. This conception of the universe is a product of evolution, and Professor Haeckel has been chosen as the principal representative of this school in order to avoid numerous quotations not adapted to the purpose of this article.

THE PROTECTIONIST MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND

HILLAIRE BELLOC

IF one had stopped a man of one's acquaintance eighteen months ago in the streets of London and asked him whether he was a free trader, it would have had much the same effect as asking him whether he was a Christian. He would have taken it for granted that you were asking a wild question; he would have answered vaguely in the affirmative and would have thought no more about it. He was a free trader. He had not thought out the matter. He took free trade for granted.

Here and there a violent and fanatical person would have answered vehemently, "No!" and would have begun to argue at great length. The same is true on the question of religion. And as the minority who refused the name of Christian would have been small and somewhat despised, so were the minority who refused to call themselves free traders.

To-day, if you ask the same question, it is thought a reasonable, even an engrossing one; whether you receive an answer in the affirmative or the negative is a matter of even doubt. In the country as a whole seven out of thirteen will call themselves free traders. In London the proportion is somewhat less. There is a clear majority for free trade, but a very large minority indeed for protection, and that minority hopes, not perhaps at the next election, but at the election after next, to become a majority. What is the nature of so rapid, so singular and apparently so profound a revolution in the public mind?

A great number of highly educated men, and what is more men with a long experience of the House of Commons, believe it to be a flare. Sudden attempts of this sort (though hardly of this magnitude) have been known in the past; they are within the recollection of many. It is notorious that they never had a serious hold upon the imagination of the electorate. They were finally defeated in their first battle. Mr. Chamberlain's sudden declaration and its consequences appeared to very many such men (and those among the best judges) to be an empty, violent, and gaseous flame of this kind. The protectionist movement was held to have no fuel to maintain it. Its force was thought to lack momentum because it was devoid of mass.

The judgment was erroneous. The flame is fed with a permanent supply of fuel. It has taken hold and is already warm. I shall discuss somewhat later the chances of success which the propaganda may have; the first and the main part of my task is to show that the new political movement relies upon a basis not likely to fail it through the lapse of time suffi-

ciently broad to insure, if not the accomplishment of its object, at least its prolonged activity.

It is, in the first place, necessary to notice with what increasing force that method in public life which is called "The Practical" has dominated our politics. To attempt a definition of the philosophy which underlies it would be to wander into the religion of metaphysics. It is enough to note, as does Boutmy, in company with other perhaps more accurate foreign observers, that this way at looking at the affairs of the state which has always been characteristic of Englishmen has lately grown to exclude all others. Where we were once careless, we are now contemptuous, of general principles. Where we were once astonished and a little irritated by deduction and set plan, we are now ignorant of them. The symptoms of this development have long been apparent. Oratory has almost disappeared. A certain excellence in the abstract sciences has deserted our universities, and the tendency to regard each problem as it arises in the concrete and in detail has at last ousted every other intellectual appetite where the management of the state is concerned.

It has often been said that the adoption of free trade in the middle of the nineteenth century was an exception to this rule. A fundamental and abstract principle of economics has been thought to have arrested the mind of Parliament and of the electorate, and to have been applied to the most important of the material problems which then confronted the nation. It is indeed true that the men who were born with the century were capable of a wider grasp of more powerful generalizations than are their descendants; nevertheless, the adoption of free trade was far from being the application of an economic theory.

Cobden's unique character has misled more than one critic of this period. He was of that idealist sort to whom a logical deduction and all that should accompany it are a necessary action of the mind. An admirable theoretician a man whose fears and consistent enthusiasms were, in morals and political theory even more than in economics, part of one scheme of thought, he maintained himself throughout the whole of his creative career superior to and apart from the generality of politicians. There is an illuminating anecdote recorded of what passed between Cobden and one of those schemers who was soliciting some favor—if I remember right the politician was Palmerston; and the favor he sought was acceptance of office. "You know, my dear Cobden," said he, "I have not minded the hard things you have said of me" . . . such phrases are of the commonest in political life. "I meant them," answered Cobden—such an answer is of the rarest.

Cobden was certainly a man of dogma, and those who would at the

present moment counteract his effect upon English life are not wrongly inspired when they sneer at him for professing a creed and for judging daily affairs in the light of ideas.

But the men who carried the policy through, the men of whom Peel is perhaps the most typical, suffered or enjoyed no such refinements. The repeal of the corn laws was a necessity. A population increasing with startling rapidity, unenfranchised and therefore incalculable in its force, lacked bread. Those industries of the nation which were already our pride, were becoming our mainstay, were patently strangled by a system which (as patently) enriched none but those who were already the richest in the community.

Moreover, no protection, save that of agriculture, was for a moment in question. Our manufacturers possessed a supremacy that was rapidly becoming a monopoly. It would have been ridiculous to have taxed raw materials, and as for finished articles, the mass of our staple productions had not any fear of competition in the home market, scarcely any in the foreign. We dug coal, we spun cotton, we made engines and rails for the world. It was the most practical of reforms. No idealism was necessary to accept it, no abstraction of thought to comprehend or to advocate it. Its various parts were all good. The laborer saw more employment and more food, the capitalist a wider and less hampered market. If each of the parts were good, what need had a practical electorate and its practical representatives to strain at grasping an abstract economic problem?

By that irony which is the salt of history this same practical attitude towards public things is the principal enemy free trade has now to fear. The English elector of the middle class has read for some years that protected Germany, protected France and protected America have increased their wealth rapidly during the last generation. The colonies, which he is accustomed to regard as communities formed from the best examples of his own race and solving his own problems under the freest of conditions, have prospered under protection. When he is an exporter he finds himself partially excluded from markets where he once entered more freely or perhaps quite unrestricted. As a consumer he notices (largely through the action of his own pressure upon Parliament) the mark of a foreign origin upon an increasing number of the things he buys. He cannot touch and handle the enormous expanse of our shipping, of our insurance business, of our foreign investments. The phrase "invisible exports" sounds to him something like a jest. What he can notice is the decay of the glass trade in this place (where he may be living), of the silk trade in that. The very magnitude of the changes which free trade involves persuades him of

evils which he exaggerates. It is easier to remember the loss of some one flourishing industry than to note the gradual (more than compensating) increase of another.

Here is an example: It was my business for some months to deliver lectures in South Wales. I had visited this district many years ago when I was a boy, and certainly the impression now left upon my mind was of a leap forward comparable only to what takes place in new countries. Villages had coalesced and had become towns. Country sides, for their good or their hurt, but certainly for their material profit, had become industrialized. The chief centres had perhaps doubled in area and population. Well, in the course of my lecturing I heard one principal complaint. The McKinley tariff had destroyed the tin-plate trade!

This, then, is the principal basis upon which Mr. Chamberlain's campaign reposes. It is upon this terrain that the most damaging attacks against free trade will be conducted. Examples appealing to the eye, small details, particular and personal or local memories of failure will be appealed to. The practical mind retains such things; against them can only be set statistics, a forgotten piece of history and (most true and therefore alas! most valueless) the broad theories of economic science.

This same practical spirit is injuring us in a hundred other ways which are not to the purpose of this paper. It lulls us into a fancied security. It regards our certain success in the past rather than the doubtful aspect of our future. It ignores the principal phenomenon of this opening century. It means that the civilizations which have sown in regular theory and order are beginning to reap their harvest. But its most immediate effect will certainly be felt in this question of the reform of our tariff.

To this main tendency in the mind of the more permanent part of the electorate must be added another upon which the protectionist campaign will depend. It has, I think, been somewhat exaggerated by our neighbors or rivals. I mean the dislike of the foreigner. That this spirit would lead directly to protection needs no argument. It would not be an economic nor strictly a political force. It would be negative and unreasoning. It would have many effects perhaps more far-reaching than the destruction of our fiscal system. But that such a revolution would follow upon the exaggeration of hostility to whatever was European, yet not English, would, on the face of it, lead in the direction of a differentiation against their goods. If a sufficient number of electors be exasperated by the sight of a French motor-car, a German clock or a Norwegian door, there will be a tendency to exclude these things. The individual will hardly sacrifice himself and buy dearer or worse articles, but, by a piece of philosophy which is the

commonest phenomenon in history he will act as one of a number to forbid to himself that which—acting of himself—he would enjoy.

I repeat this feeling, though undoubtedly increasing has been exaggerated. The good-humored and rather ignorant banter of the old "Punchets" is largely but not wholly supplanted by acerbity. The note has been heard in our liberalism more and more loudly in recent years, but it is only an enemy of England, and one that had an interest in seeing her decline that would pretend such a note to be dominant. I would regard that sentiment as an ally, but only as a secondary and far weaker ally, of the spirit I have already described at greater length.

There is a third element in the growth of the protectionist spirit; it is one that certainly could be found nowhere else but in England, and one which has singularly advanced in the past the greatness of this country. It has no special name, though it is among the most silent of modern European Kings. I will call it "The individual development of the gentry."

The class which with its adherents has so long governed England, the class which gives all their spirit to our two universities, the House of Parliament and the learned professions, produces a peculiar isolation of type within itself; a self-development, a self-discovery in individuals which is closely allied on the one hand to the perpetual amateurishness which foreigners notice in English things, and on the other that spirit of odd, unsystematic exploration and adventure of which they prove their respect by a recent but very thorough imitation. The Englishman of the upper class who is destined to attain the highest places in his career, and therefore to influence his generation in some degree, pushes to the uttermost extreme a passion for private experience, private adventure, and the private solutions of the problems around him. He pursues as a wealthy man throughout his life that eccentricity or search which distinguishes the youth of the middle class in the universities of other countries.

On this account it is certain that when a new idea of any sort (or an old idea revived) enters the general arena of the nation, it will always find supporters well trained in argument, three-quarters sincere, wealthy, and above all determined that their individuality shall tell. The Prime Minister is of this kind.

I have heard fiat-money defended with conviction and with admirable illustrations and learning in the common room of an Oxford college. I have heard not one but many men of vast reading maintain that the Englishmen of Henry II.'s reign were Anglicans rather than Catholics. I have heard a distinguished writer upon military history—one who had seen some sort of war—deny that artillery had a rôle left to it in modern battles.

This appetite for settling of one's self and by an original act whatever doubts may be proposed, has produced a very considerable body of learned and even enthusiastic protectionists in Parliament and on the press. The process has been at work for some years. It has borne remarkable fruit.

It was enough that the general mass accepted free trade to make a few quite original and quite exceptional brains among the privileged classes question its conclusions. Not all, not the majority, ended by dissenting from the general economics of the country. But a minority have so ended and that minority is powerful: a kind of intellectual coterie which, because it is small, frees itself to be an aristocracy.

An examination of the principal supports of the new movement would not be complete did we neglect to answer a number of particular questions. Thus it may be asked: Is the agricultural interest in favor of the change? Are the Irish? Does the "Imperial" sentiment weigh much with those who support the movement? Are the great moneyed interests which it would seem to damage solidly arrayed against it? Lastly, and most momentous of all, has the agitation a chance of succeeding?

As to the first point, I should reply without hesitation that the agricultural interest is opposed to Mr. Chamberlain. The movement is essentially an industrial one, and even without such evidence as the recent election at Oswestry, my own experience of that part of England which I know best—the purely agricultural district of West Sussex—would convince me that the rural population will and must vote against protection. No practicable tariff would so raise the price of cereals as to restore the conditions of thirty years ago. Moreover, the number of those who desire to restore those conditions has greatly lessened. The smaller agricultural industries, the more intensive, have developed and have thrived; and though most of our electorate do not know it, throughout Europe, whether unprotected (as is Denmark) or protected (as is Normandy), the smaller industries are paying best. Mr. Chamberlain's scheme would not only raise the price of the small farmer's implements, building material, feed, etc., in a small but irritating degree, it would also harass him by putting an additional tax upon his clothes, his furniture, and his few luxuries. The agricultural laborer is also dead against it. He is against it on the simplest of grounds; the ground of the big loaf. Alone of modern Englishmen he preserves some sort of historic tradition. The memory of protection, exaggerated as a rule and hardly applicable to the present proposals, is vivacious in his family. He will not tolerate the thinnest of thin edges when that wedge is concerned.

The Irish members would perhaps (upon the whole) favor the change; but it would be an error to weigh their interests too carefully. They have

but one serious object in politics, the securing of a tolerable government for the Irish people. They believe there to be but one way of attaining this: the government of Ireland by its inhabitants. To that end they will certainly sacrifice every economic consideration, and their attitude upon the fiscal question will depend in the main upon the majority the free traders may obtain at polls. If it is very large, the Irish will presumably join the weaker party, and wait their next opportunity. If it is less (say) than one hundred they will make satisfaction of their demands a condition of their alliance with the Liberals.

The desire for Imperial Federation, though it is perhaps the strongest of the vaguer forces present in our politics to-day, plays a less part in the demand for fiscal reform than might be imagined from the speeches of the late Colonial Secretary. It is recognized that the colonies can make what tariff they please, while we are bound to the gravest caution by our European positions and our dense population. It is almost universally admitted that the moment a scheme was sketched out, some one of the colonies would be benefited at the expense of some other. We have—or we are supposed to have—no means of enforcing a pact or of competing successfully with the reciprocity or retaliation of foreign nations. Finally, we have everything to lose in the bargain and they but little to gain. At first the connection of protection with an economic tie between the mother-country and the colonies was the strongest part of all Mr. Chamberlain's scheme: stronger (for instance) than his pledge that the extra revenue should pay for old-age pensions; but in the course of the past year, so many people have considered the details of the problem and so many have discovered its insuperable complexity that the force of that particular argument has very greatly diminished.

As for the solidarity of the principal interests threatened by protection, it is curious to note that it is not perfect. The bankers are perhaps united. Lancashire is nearly but not absolutely so; and the shipowners, whom of all men one would imagine to fear the effects of such a departure, are divided; in what proportion it is impossible to tell, but certainly one of the very first men to support the new cry was a principal shipowner and member of Parliament.

Of far greater importance, however, than any of these questions is the last. What chance has the agitation of succeeding?

I am well aware that it cannot command a majority at the polls either this year or next. Nevertheless, the possibility of its triumph in five or ten years does not seem to me so remote as it is believed to be. There are a number of considerations which should not be overlooked in the examination of this question and which are yet of too little immediate weight to attract

the attention of politicians. There is the effect of bad times; there is the new electorate; there is the press;—more powerful than all the rest put together, there is the difficulty of paying the national bills.

No one who remembers the last cycle of lean years can forget the last of "a cry." All England—especially the large towns and more especially the capital—was hungry for it. Things were going wrong, men were out of employment. Mills were running short time—and yet there was no cheap and obvious panacea! There were strikes, there was a prodigious amount of marching and talking and a riot or two. There was plenty of company promoting—none of these things appeared to relieve the pressure. Now in the next experience of this kind (and in the conditions of our savings since the South African adventure it will be more severe) there will be a cry already made. "We offered you protection," the new party will say, "you would not have it. We told you ruin was coming: it has come. Even now it is not too late. Clap on a tariff and you will get work." The argument will tell. Men will notice that free trade has not prevented the recurrence of their troubles. They will prefer a promised employment to a cheap but unattainable loaf. The pledges that fail to win them in 1905 may easily do so in 1908 or 1910.

The new electorate is a further element in the problem. For the first time in English history we have an electorate numbering fully seven-tenths of our adult male population. To put it more graphically, the number of Englishmen who actually do vote is half, or even more than half, the total number who would have a right to vote in a democracy. Of these millions, by far the greater portion are but gradually learning that the suffrage is a power which they can translate into legislation. To them the appeal is direct. "Don't listen to high-and-dry economists when you can't understand. Tax the foreigner and the bad times, secure employment." It is to be feared that a demand of this kind will fall just at the moment when the new electorate has learnt its power and that the learning of that lesson may precisely coincide with the coming of the lean years.

The cry will survive defeat because it has behind it a principle, an organized and perhaps a convinced press. In the north of England that press is not of the first strength. In London and the Midlands it is overwhelming, and the area covered by the London and Midland press can decide an election. All the great London daily papers but three are attached to the Unionist party, and of them all but one are not partially or lukewarmly, but whole-heartedly protectionist. The *Morning Post*, the *Times*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*, the *Globe*, the *St. James's Gazette*, the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express* are as hotly in favor of the new policy as was ever Sir Ashmead Bartlett in the days when he stood almost alone—the pioneer of a time he did not live to see.

Interests of such a kind will not permit their effort to dwindle at the shock of a single election, any more than did the Unionist or the Home-Rule press permit it. It would be folly to imagine that this press will abandon its attitude even after the approaching (and discounted) defeat at the polls.

There is, finally, a political force making with fatal strength for the experiment of protection. It is, as I have said, of far greater strength than all others combined. I mean the necessities of the treasury. Our free traders either do not notice this force, or they purposely ignore it. They deplore extravagance, but they never mention in their defense of the past the active menace which our expenditure presents to the existing fiscal system.

Modern England cannot spend less than £140,000,000 a year. She could do so by abandoning a number of activities which her wisest political men deplore; but to abandon them would mean such a revolution in the popular temper as certainly cannot be achieved.

Now, there is no supplementary source of taxation left open. The rich will not pay more, the working classes will not directly pay anything; the middle class, especially the lower middle class, cannot pay more.

It is true to say that no single large resource remains for the treasury with a falling credit and an increasing expenditure, but to raise the existing tariff and to impose new duties. The death duties cannot be increased; the income tax is only tolerated at its present level because a certain amount of evasion is winked at, and any taxation which fell directly upon the mass of the population would upset within a few weeks the government that proposed it.

Certainly the navy will be added to year after year as Germany and as Russia build their new fleets; certainly larger and larger sums will be required for social experiments; certainly an electorate fed upon the literature which still delights it will demand a succession of small, abortive and very costly wars; certainly our foreign policy will continue to be firm and correspondingly expensive. Even were such a danger not present, there is no historical example of an imperial revenue which has voluntarily suffered diminution.

There are but two ways of gratifying such desires. One is by borrowing; the other is by creating money out of nothing. With consols permanently below 90, we cannot borrow upon any considerable scale; as it is we are spending more than we receive. We shall therefore, I fear, be tempted to try the philosopher's stone and to draw gold out of nothing, or, as Mr. Chamberlain puts it, "from the foreigner." The gods avert such a folly! But the danger is there.

MARIA EDGEWORTH

HORATIO S. KRANS

THE recent appearance of a biography¹ of Miss Edgeworth in the English Men of Letters Series, and of a new edition of her tales and novels,² once more calls attention to the life and work of a woman, who, in Macaulay's judgment, was, after Madame de Staël, the most remarkable woman of her time. In her own day her fame reached far and wide. On her occasional visits to London and Paris she was enthusiastically lionized; and in Ireland it was to Edgeworthstown that literary pilgrims wended their way. Thither went Scott and Wordsworth, and thither also Edward Fitzgerald repaired, domesticating himself with great contentment during a happy fortnight's visit. But now that Miss Edgeworth's name and fame have receded a little into the past, literary criticism for the most part speaks of her in vague terms, seems to know her only at second hand, and is content to repeat the old condescending pleasantries relative to her didactic tendency. Indeed a superstition does now more or less prevail that Miss Edgeworth's novels drag themselves uniformly through a heavy slough of didacticism, and are all precept, principle, and preaching. It must in truth be confessed that the moralizing mania is the great blotch upon her art. At the same time, it is a rude criticism that stares fixedly upon this unhappy defect and misses the finer features of her work, upon which it is possible to dwell with pleasure. From the current complaints about Miss Edgeworth's primness it might be concluded that the superior-young-person heroines and the good-young-man heroes were the only people in her books. Such a notion is far from the truth. Interesting scapegraces of both sexes swarm through, and enliven her stories. There are gay, daring, intriguing fine ladies ever on the gad for pleasure; there are dissipated lords and dashing gentlemen, playing the gay Lothario, gambling, and indecorously intoxicating themselves at Ranelagh or Vauxhall. In truth, there is at moments in these novels a hurly-burly of reckless gaiety and more or less tragic disaster. There are balls and routs in splendid houses, whose doors are haunted by duns or sheriff's officers. Debt, drink and duels, bankruptcies and arrests, flirtations, flights and suicides—all these have their place in tales, which, it would appear from the general speech of critics, were in all points the very pink of propriety and the depth of dullness.

¹ "Maria Edgeworth" (English Men of Letters Series). By the Hon. Emily Lawless. The Macmillan Co., New York and London, 1904.

² "The Works of Maria Edgeworth" (Macmillan's Pocket Classics. 6 vols.). The Macmillan Co., New York and London, 1903.

But, though Miss Edgeworth's name is not always in the magazines and literary reviews, and though the class of readers who snap up all the latest fiction pass her by, she has still her steady stream of readers and has by no means dropped out of currency. Of this the libraries assure us, as do the continually appearing editions of her works.

As regards the new edition of Miss Edgeworth's tales and novels, but a word need be said. It is an illustrated edition, compact and handy, presentable in appearance and commendable in general make-up. Each volume is furnished with a delightful introduction by Mrs. Anne Thackeray Ritchie. It is not a complete edition, and in this connection the query suggests itself why "Ennui" was excluded from the collection, while less excellent stories find a place in it. The latest biography of Miss Edgeworth is by the Hon. Emily Lawless, the author of several Irish novels, and of the "History of Ireland" in the "Story of the Nation Series." In considering this biography it will be convenient to examine first its criticism of Miss Edgeworth's work.

In the opening sentence of her book Miss Lawless declares her intention of dwelling particularly upon the Irish aspect of the fiction she considers. This is proper and natural, both because the Irish stories are the best and because the author and her subject are Irish women. But in the attempt to carry out this intention the author has left much to be desired.

If Miss Edgeworth's novels are to be classified the great cleavage will be found to lie between the Irish stories ("Castle Rackrent," "The Absentee," "Ormond," "Ennui") and the rest. These two classes of novels will be considered separately. Since the Irish tales are primarily novels of manners, and since it is the function of this *genre* to present man rather as the creature of a particular time and place than in his universal aspect, it behooves the critic of tales such as these to regard the personages in them as social types, to explain them as the products of social and historical conditions, and in a general way to indicate the points of contact between these novels and the Irish life of which they are an expression. From this point of view the treatment of them has been very inadequate. An illustration or two will make plain what is meant. For instance, it would have been advantageous to point out that in "Castle Rackrent" three of the four landlords are representatives of the reckless, extravagant, claret-drinking, trigger-pulling, Irish gentry of pre-union days, and that the tale, as a whole, in portraying their manners, becomes a picture of a national disorder in an acute stage, which, in a few generations, was to ruin a good part of the old families of the land. Further, it would not have been amiss to note that the graceless Sir Kit of the same story is a type of those irresponsible, impecunious, gambling, fire-eating Irish adventurers, the terror of match-making mammas with susceptible daughters,

who made Bath their hunting ground in the second half of the eighteenth century, and who found a place among the *dramatis personae* of Fielding and Sheridan. Again, in "Ormond," the critic should have made plain the status in Irish society of Cornelius O'Shane, and the very different position occupied by his brother, Sir Ulick—the one the type of a Catholic gentleman produced by the penal laws, who lived in the unambitious seclusion those laws made inevitable; the other, a type of the gentleman, Catholic by birth, who, to escape the disabilities under which his co-religionists labored, turned Protestant with an eye to profit and preferment. And since Miss Edgeworth's critic promised at the start to dwell especially upon the Irish side of her work, it would have been fitting to attend carefully to her portraiture of Irish women. Some comment upon Lady Clonbrony, of "The Absentee," would have been to the point. She was a familiar type in Irish society—the woman ambitious of social distinction in England, who, turning her back upon her own country, aped the accent and deportment of English women, and would fain conceal her Irish birth. Finally, it was certainly a slight to pass by unnoticed the Lady Geraldine, of "Ennui." Miss Edgeworth has presented no more engaging embodiment of the national character and temper. Among the women of her novels Lady Geraldine is, if not the most charming, at least the most piquant and interesting. Attention might have been called to the distinctively national features of this faithful and cleverly executed potrait—to the generous impulsiveness, the candid, unconstrained manner, the touch of eloquence in her talk, the love of fun, and the raillery and stiletto wit that made her the dread of arrogance and dull pomposity. These remarks upon the four Irish stories are not designed to indicate what has been left undone, but what a careful criticism would have attempted to do, in the way of precise definition of social types, and in the way of making plain the relation between these novels and Irish society.

The criticism of the non-Irish novels—they are mainly novels of English manners and character—is surprisingly cursory and perfunctory. Miss Lawless' book does little to help a reader to a better understanding or appreciation of the world of these stories, the people who dwell in that world, and the kind of incidents that happen in it. Several of the novels are given short shrift, and but scant justice is meted out to those that are considered at any length. A careful and discriminating criticism can speak better for Miss Edgeworth's work than her last biographer has spoken. The comments upon "Belinda" are a case in point. The conception of this story is full of delightful possibilities. It tells of the experiences of a young girl, gently bred, who comes up to London from the country, and gazes with innocent, astonished eyes at the world of fashion and gayety

to which she is introduced. With rare skill the character is developed as the story advances, until at last the innocent girl becomes the woman of dignity and delicacy, her freshness and purity unspoiled by the pressure of cynical, worldly counsels, and the disillusionments that come with experience. And yet despite the interest of the central situation, and despite the charm of the young girl whose character is so truthfully conceived, and so skilfully projected, Miss Lawless can find hard things to say of "Belinda," the book—she speaks of it as sinking into a "morass of dull moralizing and ponderous, soul-wearying propriety"—and can remain indifferent to the attractions of Belinda the heroine. Indeed, one looks in vain to Miss Edgeworth's latest critic for any new light of knowledge or sympathy upon either the Irish or the English novels.

But what is strangest in this biography—and it constitutes an astonishing and inexplicable hiatus—is the failure to attempt to define Miss Edgeworth's place either in the literary history of her own country, or in that of England. One can read the whole book through without so much as suspecting the existence of a group of Irish novelists—Lever and Lover, Carleton, the Banims, and Gerald Griffin, the more conspicuous among them—who were writing in the first half of the nineteenth century. To have compared her standpoint with the standpoints of these novelists, her compatriots and fellow laborers in the same field, and to have regarded her pictures of Irish life and character side by side with their pictures, would have been, it need scarcely be said, to throw a bright light over her Irish novels and tales, and to leave the reader with a clearer conception of what Miss Edgeworth could do and what she could not do in Irish fiction. To have so considered her would have been to say, and it should have been said, that it remained for William Carleton, the creative genius among Irish story-tellers, and a Celt in blood and bone, and in spirit, to portray aspects of peasant character of which Miss Edgeworth had no just conception. It was Carleton, and in a less degree the Banims and Griffin, who knew how to present the Celtic peasants as the true children of the mystic race of old Ireland, on one side full of tragic elements, of vindictiveness and subtle cunning, of visionary faith and purity, on the other side as lively, expansive, capacious, volatile, tender, and melancholy. That Miss Edgeworth's biographer, herself an Irishwoman, should have neglected to assign Miss Edgeworth a place among Irish novelists, and particularly that she should have neglected to do so at this moment, when the voice of the Irish literary revivalist is loud in the land with the cry of "Ireland for the Irish" in literature as elsewhere, is a puzzle to which the writer can offer no solution.

To assign Miss Edgeworth her place in English literature—since her biographer has not attempted it, it may be attempted here—should not be a difficult matter. She, with Miss Burney, Miss Austen, and Mrs. Radcliffe, carried off the best share of the honors of novel-writing between Sterne and Scott. Miss Edgeworth represents also a distinct step in the history of English fiction. She was the first to make a careful study of provincial life and manners, and the first to give careful and respectful attention to peasant life. Scott himself says it was from her that he took the idea of doing for Scotland what she had done for Ireland. And, since Miss Edgeworth's influence is here the question, it may be mentioned that her studies of Irish peasant life suggested to Turgeneff his studies of the Russian peasant, which, by their effect upon the Czar, were instrumental in bringing about the emancipation of the Russian serfs—a consummation which, had she lived to know of it, would have been a sweet consolation to Miss Edgeworth's noble and kindly spirit.

Up to the appearance of "Castle Rackrent" (1800)—and would that her biographer had enlarged a little upon this head—Irish character had made, in the drama and in eighteenth-century novels and essays, but a casual, and generally a farcical, appearance in English literature. It remained for that story to give English novel-readers the first picture of Irish life and character as they were in truth and reality. But Miss Edgeworth's place in literature is not based merely upon her influence and upon the new departures she inaugurated. "Castle Rackrent" stands high as a novel of manners. It performs admirably the functions of that literary kind in carrying lightly upon a rapid current of narrative a quantity of curious information as to Irish customs and character. And in the person of old Thady of that tale she has created a universal type of the faithful retainer that can never lose its charm. For all these reasons, and more besides, this story is sure of a permanent, if a modest, place in English literature. As for the other stories—Irish and English—they should, some of them at least, have a long life, and find a goodly company of readers made up of those who are content to read what is good, though it be not the best, in its kind.

In plan Miss Lawless' book suffers from the want of right perspective and artistic economy. Not to speak at random, the account of "Bishop Berkeley's tar-water," and a list (which should have been relegated to a footnote) of the prices paid for Miss Edgeworth's novels occupy, each of them, as much of the text as is given to three of the novels—"The Dun," "Manceuvring," and "Mme. de Fleury"—taken together. And the long digression concerning the French at Killala and Castlebar, runs on to such

length and is so impertinent to the business in hand, that the reader might fancy himself in the mid-stream of Miss Lawless' "History of Ireland." In its style this biography quite lacks distinction. Too often the expression flaps loosely about the thought, and loose-jointed sentences not infrequently point to carelessness in the writing. This is unhappily emphasized at the very close of the volume. The two concluding sentences move so heavily, and strike the ear so unpleasantly, that one can only wonder at their being permitted to stand as the farewell words of the author to the reader.

Considered as a record of Miss Edgeworth's life, little need be said of this volume. The important facts are there and the salient features of her character are brought into clear relief. It does not succeed in disengaging, as well as does Mrs. Ritchie's exquisite sketch in the "Book of Sibyls," the distinctive charm of Miss Edgeworth's personality. As a combined biography and criticism it will not supersede the old life by Miss Zimmern. It does not reach the high level of scholarly care and critical insight that prevails in the group of biographies to which it is the latest addition. Miss Edgeworth, alas, has not entered the English Men of Letters Series as auspiciously as have her sister-novelists, Miss Frances Burney and George Eliot.

Of one aspect of the book it remains to speak, and it would be thankless to pass it by. It is almost uniformly bright and entertaining. A stream of agreeable levitation enlivens it from first to last. Mr. Edgeworth, the father of the novelist, and one whom no one with a sense of humor could let entirely alone, is installed as the comedian of the book. His complicated marriage arrangements—he was four times a husband, and became the father of between fifteen and twenty children—afford much entertainment. He is presented also as the intellectual busy-body, enthusiastically riding all kinds of hobbies, and dabbling vigorously in philosophy, politics, science, mechanics, education, and literature. Miss Lawless hits off to perfection his harmless whim-whams, his pomposities, and his ecstasies of self-complacency. And picturesque and pleasant passages are not wanting in the book. The most glowing pages are those that tell of Miss Edgeworth's visit to Sir Walter Scott, of the warm friendship of the two authors, and of Sir Walter's visit to Edgeworthstown. Other pleasing aspects of the biography plead for further comment, but space forbids. Suffice it to repeat that the book has this conspicuous merit—it is eminently readable.

LETTERS OF H. H. TAINE

WILLIAM MORTON PAYNE

FRENCH literature, as compared with English, is notably deficient in biography, particularly in the intimate form of biography which comes from the hand of the subject, whether as direct narrative or as collected journals, memoirs, and correspondence. When an Englishman or an American of any consequence dies, we take for granted that his life in some form will soon appear in print; in the case of a Frenchman, the chances are rather against any publication. At least, the French have too just a sense of proportion to stock their book-shops after the English fashion with inflated lives of mediocrities and voluminous collections of trivial letters that few persons will ever wish to read. With their really great men, of course, the case is different; they preserve with scrupulous care all the documentary material that has been left, and deal with it in a spirit of editorial thoroughness that leaves nothing to be desired. But even then, the official biography, as we understand it, is apt to remain unwritten. We do not often get as close an approach to it as we have in the "Life and Letters of H. Taine," now in course of publication; this deeply interesting work is at present appearing, both in French and English, the translation being made by Mrs. R. L. Devonshire. Two volumes are already at hand, coming down to the year 1870, and in them we may follow the intellectual development of one of the most clear-sighted of our modern philosophical critics and historians throughout the entire formative period of his career.

The plan of this work is such as to leave Taine to speak for himself, except in so far as some brief summary of facts is now and then required to set forth his external relations at a given period, as to bridge a gap between different sections of his correspondence. His shrinking from personal publicity was so marked and the injunction laid upon his literary executors so severe, that the editing of these letters has been no easy task. His will absolutely forbade the publication of his intimate or private correspondence, permitting to be printed only such letters as dealt with "purely general or speculative matters," and requiring that even from those all the passages which "in any degree concern private life" should be left out. Nevertheless, the element of human interest in the correspondence, even after this treatment, remains considerable, for it is quite impossible to carry out to the letter so rigid an injunction. Enough editorial discretion has been exercised to make of the work much more than the self-revelation of a disembodied intellect; it affords a continuous narrative of the essential facts of Taine's life, and throws no little light upon his personal character.

The nobility of purpose and integrity of soul that were to characterize his entire career find expression in some of his earliest letters. At twenty he writes, in a sort of boyish confession of philosophical faith: "I will now set down what I believe I have found; but, at this very moment, I pledge myself to continue by researches, never pausing, never considering that I know anything and ever examining my principles anew; it is only thus that truth can be reached." And a year later, we find him declaring: "I will defend no doctrine by my writings without being convinced that it is a rational one." This single-eyed devotion to truth, coupled with the firm conviction that the stars in their courses are the allies of the fighter in its cause, became the formula of Taine's life, and there never lived a man whose whole intellectual activity better deserved *veritatem dilexi* for its summing up. This practice and this belief preserved his continence of soul through all the years of the tinsel empire when his country sank to the nadir of its abasement, and kept him fresh to join in its struggle for regeneration and the regaining of its lost self-respect.

It is interesting to note just how he was affected by the crime of the Second of December. Two or three years earlier, he had reached the belief that "all forms of government are indifferent in themselves and borrow their legitimacy from the acquiescence of the nation." When the Republic was stricken down by violence and dispatched by knavery, Taine was occupying, at twenty-three, his first professional post, in the College of Nevers. Some of his hot-headed friends thought that he should resign, lest his continuance in the service make him in some slight degree a sharer in the infamy of Louis Napoleon's act. But he took the ground "that a professor is not a *préfet*, that he is a functionary of the State, not of the Government, and that it is not joining the latter to teach the history of Sesostris and Darius." When the *plébiscite* confirmed the imperial usurpation he wrote to Prévost-Paradol: "I will give no adhesion to an action which I look upon as dishonest; but I think I can conscientiously continue to teach theories on the association of ideas or comparative judgment." It was another matter, however, when the question was of signing a circular expressing subserviency to the new political order, and this the young professor of philosophy indignantly refused to do. "Entrusted as I am," he said, "with teaching respect to law, fidelity to oaths, and the cult of the Eternal Right, I should have been ashamed to approve of perjury, usurpation, and assassination." But he accepted the verdict of universal suffrage as binding, however blind and corrupt its exercise, providing it determined the form of government only, and did not seek to trench upon those personal rights which he stoutly maintained to exist "anterior to society."

For two or three years, Taine imagined that it might be possible to maintain some sort of intellectual freedom in his connection with the official educational establishment, to patch up a *modus vivendi* which should preserve his self-respect and avoid rupture. He was by nature conciliatory up to a certain point, and was willing to make minor concessions as long as he was not called upon to sacrifice fundamental principles. Besides, his career seemed to depend upon academic success and the achievement of the university degree. But his originality and liberal ideas had become known to the authorities while he was in the Ecole Normale, and had made him an object of suspicion. Clerical control of education was a part of the price paid by Napoleon for his lease of imperial power, and a dense fog of obscurantism settled down upon the schools after 1851, stifling all freedom of thought, and creating an atmosphere in which it was almost impossible for a man of honest convictions to breathe. Taine bore it as long as he could, but the petty persecutions to which he was subjected, the suspicious watchfulness of his superiors lest he pervert the orthodoxy of his pupils, and the evident determination of the authorities to withhold from him the rightful rewards of his labors, finally forced him to let go his moorings and cast himself adrift. He obtained his doctorate after it could no longer decently be denied him, and went to Paris to seek a precarious livelihood in private teaching and writing for the reviews. The Academy was the next stronghold to be forced, and it was almost as hidebound in tradition as the University, but it capitulated in the end, and grudgingly bestowed its honors upon the young scholar.

Taine's "English Literature," completed and published just forty years ago, is the work by which the author is most widely known in England and America, and the letters now published give us many interesting facts about its history. Offered to the Academy for the Bordin prize, it found warm defenders in Guizot and Sainte-Beuve, but the zealous spokesmen of clericalism, whose hatred had pursued the author all his life, contrived to postpone the award, and he withdrew from the competition in disgust. The prize had been offered for the work presenting "the most extensive knowledge and the greatest merit in style," which prompted Taine, after hearing of his rejection, to say: "This being so, I felt that, having read the vastest literature in Europe, spent seven years over it and written a book which, I was told, was not dull, I had some excuse for competing for the prize." The letters of the seven years in question throw many side-lights upon the composition of the "English Literature." As early as 1855, we find the author writing: "I am working hard at Anglo-Saxons and Norman-Saxons—quite the meanest knaves I have ever come across; monks, trans-

lating homilies into doggerel. Shakespeare revives me a little. I am beginning to see the outlines, and to emerge from the mud-heap of details; but it is an immense labor, and practically unremunerative." A little later, he says: "My English literature is killing me. It is simply immense. I have to read enormously in order to avoid being superficial or inaccurate." Perhaps the most important fact about the history that we learn from these letters is that of its irregular and piecemeal composition. Taine seems to have worked upon it at random, plunging now into one period and now into another, writing a series of independent studies of unrelated authors, and only at the end of his labors making any serious effort to coördinate his fragmentary chapters into a single continuous work.

The most insistent criticism upon the method and theory of that work has been, of course, the obvious one that it places too much emphasis upon environment, and does not allow sufficiently for the genius of the individual. Sainte-Beuve at once placed his finger upon that defect, and based upon it his fundamental objection to a production which, for the rest, he heartily admired and praised. This makes peculiarly interesting a letter from the author to his critic, which contains the following defensive reply: "As to your fundamental objection, I think there is a misunderstanding. I never had the intention of deducing the *individual*, of demonstrating that a Shakespeare or a Swift must appear at such a time and at such a place. That is well for people who admit an ingenious Providence, a heavenly Sower, who, for kindness and calculation, deposits a seed in a hole dug on purpose. I suppose that in every epoch there is approximately the same number of highly endowed children as of rickety or consumptive ones. Given this, chance operates; it is probable that two or three Shakespeares and two or three Swifts have died of smallpox or infantile diarrhœa. Two or three others may have been enrolled in the fleet and killed in the war, etc. Chance might very well have happened to suppress that Shakespeare and that Swift who lived." The argument is too long to quote in full, but its further development makes it clear that Taine's doctrine of time, place, and *milieu* did not carry him as far as most of his critics would have us believe.

Taine's own career might well be taken as an illustration of his theory, for nothing emerges more clearly from the study of this correspondence than the way in which that career was shaped by circumstance. His individual bent was strongly in the direction of philosophical studies. Yet the conditions of his life were such as to force his activity into other channels for many years. Such philosophy as he professed could not possibly win for him advancement under the Empire and the sway of eclecticism. He won his degree, and that with difficulty, by an innocent dissertation upon La

Fontaine; he won the qualified approval of the Academy by a monograph on Livy. We have seen under what circumstances he wrote his "English Literature." The necessity of living by his pen resulted in a great quantity of miscellaneous writing upon subjects in which his interest was only secondary. His physical breakdown in early manhood forced him to travel, and thus diverted his energies into the production of the many volumes which record his impressions of art and life in diverse lands. It was not until he neared the age of forty that he first found it impossible to take up the work which, planned under various titles, it had always been the chief purpose of his life to produce. It was in 1870 that *De l'Intelligence* was published, the outcome of three years of concentrated effort and of a lifetime of previous preparation. Then came the War, startling in its revelation of the depths of materialism and corruption into which France had fallen during the nineteen years of Louis Napoleon's personal rule, and disheartening to every patriotic Frenchman. And here, again, circumstance got the better of natural inclination and turned the philosopher into the historian for good and all. The call of the hour was imperative; he could do his countrymen no better service than that of arousing them, by means of a searching self-examination based upon the most minute investigation of their history from the time of the Revolution, to a consciousness of their faults and a determination that the bitter lesson of conquest and civil disorder should at least point the way to moral triumphs in a fairer future.

Thus it came about that the remaining years of Taine's life were consecrated to his great work upon *Les Origines de la France Contemporaine*. The letters now published bring us just to this point; those yet to appear, by virtue of this very crisis in the life of both nation and individual, promise an even deeper and more vibrant interest.

THE TIMES AND THE MANNERS

“**O** *TEMPORA, O Mores!*” has been the sigh of pessimistic philosophers in all generations. If with healthy instinct the mass of humanity, assured that the present age is foremost in the files of time, smiles at the pessimism and scoffs at the philosopher, it ought nevertheless to concede that only a really human philosopher can voice his disappointments and disapprovals in a criticism of the times and the manners; for the spirit of the times, and the manners of the generation, are concrete expressions of all ideals and resignations, of all failures and achievements; and no man cares enough about them to find fault with them unless in his inmost soul he sympathizes with his fellow-man, and understands him.

In this new department of comment upon the spirit of the times, and the manners of the generation, an attempt will be made to bring into view those aspects of modern life that have a social significance—that reveal the imminent changes in the social evolution. Many signs indicate that the twentieth century is to be an age of reconstruction in the domain of social and moral relations, as the nineteenth century was an age of reconstruction in thought. New ideals have emerged from the new thought, and are making their appeal to a new composite population. New teachings are being set before the multitude. New experiments in social organization and collective effort are being made by the multitude. Out of these ideals, these teachings, these experiments will come transformation, great or small, of the social order. No indication of the nature and extent of these developments can be insignificant to the mind that believes in a possibility of moral and material progress; that awaits expectantly some measure of human betterment.

What is to be the outcome of the overwhelming change in the character of the European immigration to America? Above all, what are we to expect by way of consequence of the substitution of Italian for Baltic blood?

When the Italian immigration to this country began, a few years ago, it did not promise to contribute much Mediterranean blood to the “American race,” the making of which we are all so curiously watching. Few Italian women came, and most of the men returned to Italy to spend their American earnings. Now hordes of families come, and they come to be “Americans.” A recent special number of *Charities*, devoted to a study of the Italians in America, conveys some impression of the great rapidity with

which the south-European immigrant is being assimilated. We are made to mourn anew over the padrone system, are moved by the "sordid waste of genius" in pathetic cases, are grieved over all of the other evils set forth in this compendium of facts contributed to our sum of knowledge concerning a growing element of our population, and are left in as much danger of superficially estimating the cause of ill and prescribing the remedy thereof as ever, but we are shown distinctly enough that the Italians are being "Americanized."

Could we teach the children of these people the ideals, the arts and handicrafts by which we hope to convert them into useful citizens, with as little effort as we unconsciously exert in the education of their parents in ways of exploiting them, much saving of energy might be made. What, for instance, do we more effectively and rapidly inculcate in our elementary system, in whose far-reaching results we place so much confidence, than the instruction in successful business methods learned by these adult classes in the school of example and want? The willingness with which an Italian mother who makes a fairly comfortable living will commit her younger children to the care of some benevolent society, in order that the older children may go out to work, if it be general, is no doubt deplorable. It is as deplorable, we are inclined to be confident, as the case of Angelo, whose parents, after being "bought off" by the settlement workers who had in prospect the training of his beautiful voice, could not resist the temptation to send him surreptitiously out with the other boys to sell papers. Nevertheless, it is quite possible that our attention would not otherwise be directed to this conflict of precept and practice in our educational system taken in its entirety.

We read elsewhere of the trust methods already adopted by Italian fishermen on the Jersey coast, where they combine in maintaining crude cold-storage plants, and thus control the market, and of considerable Italian capital invested in tenement houses; we note the rapid rise of increasing numbers of these Mediterranean peoples from the wage-earning to the capitalist class in the multiplication of pushcarts and vegetable stands owned by them in our larger cities, while the more anxious among us are sorrowful because they are not sooner taught to conform to our ways. But after all is said, these people of Italy are a light-hearted, sunny folk. They love art and beauty. They are strong and industrious. Their blood will some day be mentioned by the anthropologists as one of the indispensable and fortunate components in the blood of the "American race."

Apart from the experiences of life, the chief teacher of the multitude

is the cheap newspaper, and it is only a due recognition of this fact when a Phi Beta Kappa address, by a distinguished Congressman, once himself a newspaper man, is devoted to a sharp arraignment of the methods of what the steady-faced newsmongers call sensational journalism. But it is amusing, when it is not disturbing to the serious minded, to see the unanimity with which the higher critics of the press fit the coat of censure to the luckless shoulders of the proprietors of yellow newspaper shops, and parade themselves clad in ermine and fine linen. There is need of reforming the press, but the reforming process should begin at the top. The respectable journal whose editorial policy is dictated from a money-loving and time-serving counting room may be much more dangerous to free institutions than the sensational newspapers, and the higher newspaper criticism is often unmindful of the fact that the wearing of the livery of heaven does not necessarily make the service of the devil less reprehensible than it would be without this fine recognition of the value of the costumer's art. Last fall, when the best people of the metropolis were apprehensive, and good editors were rending their garments in anticipation of what was to happen if Mayor Low should be removed from his seat on the "lid," the only newspaper in New York that told anything approximating the truth about the Democratic candidate's capacity for efficient service was of the despised and rejected yellow class, and when, after the change in administration, the "lid" kept its place, and the fact that it had even settled down a bit became so apparent that the wayfaring man saw it, only one independent newspaper in the country had the grace to apologize to Mayor McClellan. This was a New England exponent of sweetness and light which often really does tell "all the news and the truth about it."

The proprietor of that particular newspaper afterwards addressed Boston's Twentieth Century Club upon the civic responsibility of the newspaper editor. He drew with firm touch a picture of what the best newspaper for the best people should be, but he fell into the common error of ignoring the hundreds of thousands of people in our great cities who are so depraved that they would not look twice at such a newspaper if it were given to them. Even of the so-called better class of people there are thousands that will not spend time in reading anything that appeals only to a literary instinct. Let the doubter visit almost any New York City elevated railroad station on a Saturday morning. He will find the stairs and platforms carpeted with a high-class literary supplement that stands for light and leading and many other things that are worth while. Those who throw away their literary sections still read the news columns, but there are others, hundreds of thousands of them, who could not be persuaded

to read that kind of a newspaper at all. Is it not better for the submerged tenth to read the "penny-dreadfuls," as the high priests of newspaperdom like to call the "yellows," than to go without reading? In them they will find the essentials of the day's news of the world. It may be served to them in red ink and with much of expurgation and sensationalism, but the news will be at their command. They will read it, possess it, and to the extent that they acquaint themselves with the movements of the hour they will be better fitted to live in a "hustling" age and to cope with those of even sharper wits. The young men and maidens that read the yellow journals may even grow in grace until, in their declining years, they revel in pre-eminent respectability. If this is not a possibility, what becomes of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest?

Mr. Cleveland's magazine article on "The Government in the Chicago Strike" is an interesting contribution to the history of the struggle between labor on one side and capital on the other. The incidents under discussion were unusual because in this strike capital was reinforced not only by the federal courts, but by the federal troops which the President ordered to the scene of trouble. It will be remembered that Governor Altgeld sharply protested against the presence of the federal soldiers, insisting that the state of Illinois was wholly capable of preserving the peace. There was a disagreement between the national and the state executives, and for that reason it is much to be regretted that Mr. Cleveland did not give this history to the world before Mr. Altgeld's death. With but one of these doughty fighters alive, the presentation of the case is of necessity *ex parte*, and many readers will think that Mr. Cleveland's method of handling his opponent's contribution to the literature of the contest is unfortunate. Referring to Governor Altgeld's formal protest, and after quoting very briefly from it, Mr. Cleveland writes: "This opening sentence was followed by a lengthy statement which so far missed actual conditions as to appear irrelevant, and, in some parts, absolutely frivolous." Governor Altgeld was on the ground. He had a singularly active mind, and his mental processes were exceptionally rapid. Before he became governor he had been one of the best trial judges that Chicago ever had. If, in this instance, he "missed actual conditions," he went far outside his accustomed habit in respect of matters to which he gave his careful attention, and it is unusual, to say the least, to find "irrelevant" matter in his serious papers. But he is dead, and we must be content with an *ex parte* statement. And since he is dead, we could wish that Mr. Cleveland had quoted Mr. Altgeld rather than given so cavalier a characterization of what he did not quote. The

American sense of fair play, which we all prize, objects when a party to a memorable contest, who can no longer speak for himself, is denied the right to be heard through the printed record. ,

To the organizing of societies, as to the making of books, there is apparently no end. The pastor of a Chicago church, in a recent address before the Congregational ministers of that city, has, however, it would seem, disclosed the limit of the associating mania. In an impassioned appeal to his fellow clergymen he urges the formation of "home-mending societies," through whose instrumentality most of the marital troubles, as well as serious disagreements between parents and children, might be adjusted. Yet verily there is always "room for one more" in any aggregation, not excepting objects of association. Some estimable member of the Conference should have been ready to propose an organization for the cultivation of a sense of humor in clergymen.

This Chicago suggestion calls to mind the days of Mr. Samuel Sewall, Assistant Governor of Massachusetts, whose appointment to the chief justiceship of his state may have been foreshadowed by his participation in the adjustment of other people's affairs, presumably those of certain members of the congregation of the Rev. Cotton Mather, since his acquaintances of that day could hardly have been non-church members, and whose ministrations were possibly of the order advocated by the Chicago pastor. Under date of November 6, 1692, Mr. Sewall makes entry in his very interesting diary of a visit (at her request) to the grandmother of a youth, Joseph by name, who had thrown "a knob of brass" and hit his sister Betty on the forehead so as to make it "bleed and swell." For this and the further misdemeanors described as "playing in prayer-time," and "eating when Return Thanks," Mr. Sewall administered the prescribed punishment (recorded in the diary as whipping him "pretty smartly") upon Joseph, who, much after the manner of modern youth, is said to have "tried to shadow and hide himself" from "behind the head of the cradle." We are not told that the future Chief Justice was a member of a committee appointed to look after the family troubles of the district in which Joseph's grandmother lived, but it has been a matter of rather widespread congratulation with us for at least a generation or two that the jurisdiction of the church no longer extended so far as this.

Were we not confident that the plan could not have been entertained seriously by the Chicago Conference, and to that extent assured that so much apprehension on our part for the sanity of clergymen in general is unnecessary, we should like to point out to our Puritan friend some

of the ways in which a church, whose policy is so diametrically opposed to his, is in advance of his idea. Between the principle involved in "confession" and that of "church discipline" there is in the rational mind a resemblance, which it is of course impossible for either Puritan or Catholic to see. The difference might easily be counted in favor of the system that leaves the transgressor to his conscience and his father confessor, if it were not for the fact that it has been through revolt from the more open exercise of ecclesiastical authority that American ideals of liberty have been secured.

The proposition suggested by the *Slocum* and Iroquois disasters, that there is need in every community of a Society for Public Safety, is of another kind. That the departments of health, of the police, of building, and of factory inspection are not the efficient organs of administration they should be, our Tenement House Commissions, our Child Labor Committees, our Consumers' Leagues, our Society for Social Service, and other modern vigilance committees, bear us convincing testimony. All but one of these means of maintaining public safety are voluntary organizations. American civilization is unmistakably developing along these lines. We have never yet been able to secure liberty of any kind except upon eternal vigilance terms. That the owners, lessees, managers, heads of departments, overseers and others directly or indirectly responsible for the Iroquois, Darlington and other recent disasters have escaped is no reason for despair. It may or may not be that the most culpable of those responsible for the *Slocum* disaster will be made to suffer the penalty that the greater suffering of the larger community may be lessened in the immediate future. It may be that as many members of a Public Safety Committee would have been "involved," and that the pain inflicted upon the individuals to be reached by the law would have been mitigated to the same extent. It is true that some of the most prominent members of our National Civic Federation, for instance, tolerate offences that they would not for a moment endure if they were not themselves interested in the industries that employ the offensive methods. It is nevertheless socially significant that they are actively engaged in promoting other reforms. It is possible that a system of checks and balances analogous to that to be found in legislative bodies is inevitable in these privately established auxiliary institutions. However, a Committee of Public Safety has yet to suggest its functions, and to prove its inefficiency.

If the sumptuary legislation suggested by Mr. Wells' "New Republic" does not appall the thinking wage-earner who reads his "Mankind-in-the-

Making," there is little ground to hope that socialistic experiment will not lead to a state of things with which not even the beginnings of New England are comparable.

Perhaps it is inevitable that the idea of individual liberty must forever work itself out of conditions of oppression imposed by the very laws established by the oppressed, but it is difficult to understand how one not himself blinded by the afflicting circumstance can offer to the deliberation of oppression's victims so oft-failing a remedy for their ills. Had the exploits of the tithing-man, with his record of unlawful wearing of gold lace, of undue length of entertainment of non-tax-paying guests, and other economic sins, been foreseen, the history of the Puritan Commonwealth and of the New England theocracy might have been different. Unfortunately, the experiment that produced the tithing-man was not presented in theory to whom it was designed to benefit. The institutions of the "New Republic," happily, have been offered to us first in an innocuous literary form.

However, it is quite possible to lack understanding with respect to the best advertised of undertakings. It is the duty, therefore, of those that recognize this danger to make every effort to avoid it. That we may begin by understanding as far as we go, we wish that some of the plans already set forth for the social and economic salvation of man could be outlined with more clearness. In regard to the "minimum tenement," and "minimum wage," for example, let us ask to be informed still further upon points of detail. The model domestic arrangement by which the child of the wage earner is to be secured those advantages of light, air, space, freedom for play and safety against accident that it does not now enjoy, as outlined in the "New Republic," is, of course, one that the least imaginative of us is able to picture. One properly ventilated room for every mother, father and child, a room that can be heated, with easy access to sanitary conveniences, a constant supply of water, a minimum of furniture and equipment, a fire-guard, a separate bed or cot for the child, and another room as soon as the family increases beyond this limit, is an ideal entirely within the capacity of the most sceptical to conceive. It is the method by which this scheme of things once dreamed of only by philosophers and reformers is to be realized, that we would ask to have laid before us more fully.

In the plan for eliminating "half-capables" from the labor list, involved in the expression, "minimum wage," whereby they are to be prevented or discouraged from rearing another generation of the unfit, Mr. Wells' suggestions are bewildering. The "New Republic," as we understand it, proposes the establishment of a minimum standard of living and

rearing of children, for inability to comply with which wage-earning heads of families are to be held reponsible. In the words of the author, the New Republic "should make the parent the debtor to society" for the proper rearing of the child by exacting of him the cost of its proper maintenance by the state. Failure to pay the assessment therefor would mean incarceration in a "celibate labor establishment" until the indebtedness should be discharged. This is, of course, not so great a departure from the system already employed by existing republics—to the extent that prison labor contributes to the support of dependent classes—as at first appears. It is the new category of crimes and the half-suggested means by which the criminally negligent are to be detected that is confusing.

In his somewhat brief enumeration of crimes against children, for instance, Mr. Wells thinks it should be a punishable offence for a mother to leave children below a certain age alone for longer than a specified interval. How, let us still inquire, is the "New Republic" to regulate such a matter? Obviously it cannot wait for accident to the child to take the careless parent before the coroner or the courts. Does it propose an army of Tenement House and Village Child-Rearing Inspectors to report these demeanors? And upon what grounds does it defend this system as superior to any one of the modifications of the public nursery plan?

It is, however, when we come to the much-discussed term, "margin for the exercise of individual freedom," used by Mr. Wells in connection with the regulation of the minimum wage and standard of living, that we confess ourselves not only unenlightened, but also no longer patient.

How will the non-employment of Michael, whose "margin for the exercise of individual freedom" periodically crowded his family upon the care of society even before they became permanent wards of the state, give us any certainty of the economic independence of Miguelo? Let us suppose the ideal of the life Miguelo would like to lead to be ever so high, and his ability unquestioned, if Guilio and Tita would do their share in caring for the aged parents of Miguelo and Tita, or if Tony had not the hip disease, and Miguelo were not ambitious to get them all to the country to live, and were not saving to that end. Let us even imagine ourselves forgiving him for deceiving us about the ages of Miguelo and his sister, who ought to be in school, and who work in a candy factory, or who go to school and work in a candy factory as well. By what process shall it be brought about that Miguelo's "margin for the exercise of individual freedom" is not taken from that "insurance against premature death, or temporary disablement," which the reformers who are trying to secure him a "minimum wage" plainly tell us is to be expected of him? Will the

"New Republic" establish a bureau for the adjustment of these things, or will it be left to private initiative?

Our zeal for these missing details would perhaps be unwarranted were the author of "Anticipations" and "The War of Worlds" the only one unawakened to their importance. It is the fact that he voices an increasing demand among reformers generally for results out of all proportion to means thus far suggested that we are unable to overlook.

While Japan is astounding the civilized world by her military prowess and her amazing command of the most modern scientific methods, she continues to send us in her literature delightful and instructive revelations of the survival among her people of the ideas and customs that have made and moulded them.

Mr. Nobushige Hozumi, Professor of Law in the University of Tokio, has written an English translation of his recent book, "Ancestor-Worship and Japanese Law," which more than justifies his hope that it will contribute somewhat to the world's knowledge of ancestor-worship, inasmuch as the subject is here treated by one who has been able to study the phenomenon from within.

Mr. Hozumi's book is written in the scientific spirit, and not only conveys a definite idea of his subject, but it is also a concise statement of facts whose significance and correlation are left to the reader. Much interesting information is presented showing how persistently this ancient custom has controlled the destinies of Japan, and accounting for some of the grotesqueness of Japanese civilization to-day. But our interest in the book really lies in the preface. The rite of ancestor-worship performed with the aid of electricity, as described in this introductory chapter, is indeed "a curious blending of past and present." But to those interested in the less spectacular aspect of the subject the mental attitude of a man who is able to trace this custom back to the most primitive of superstitions, and who yet signs himself an ancestor-worshipper, is a phenomenon of far greater moment. Here we have, it would seem, the true type of the pragmatist, as the term is used by Mr. Gustav Spiller. Certainly no mere rationalist could be expected to treat the subject with so impartial a hand. It is evident that reason, in the oriental mind at least, is in no danger of being "swallowed up in hatred of superstition."

It was M. Fustel de Coulanges, whose investigations Mr. Hozumi holds in such profound admiration, Sir Henry Maine, Sir John Lubbock, von Jhering, Hearn and others, who were first to point out to us that "the past never completely dies for man," that at every epoch he is the epitome

of all the other epochs through which the race has passed. But, as Mr. Hozumi reminds us, these writers have given us a history of ancient laws and customs entirely from the outside. That Mr. Hozumi does not himself see the incongruity of his empirical methods and his aprioristic state of mind is not, however, entirely due to oriental conditions.

Without attempting to account for the mental attitude of the Japanese political scientist by inquiring into his western experiences, we would call attention to it as epitomizing more epochs, it may be, than any mind outside of Japan.

One other phase, the strictly transitional phase, of Japanese thought is reflected in the rapidly increasing Japanese fiction. In *Nami Ko* we have appealing testimony of the movement in Japan toward a modification of some of its marriage laws. This pathetic little story deals with the separation of a man and wife by the parents of the husband upon the ground of the threatened extinction of the family through physical unsoundness developed in the wife, a favorite theme of Japanese romance writers. Yet we are told that the old grounds for divorce embodied in the early Taiho Law have been eliminated almost entirely from the new code. The persistency of ancestor-worship would, nevertheless, make the conditions named difficult to overcome. To be assured, however, that over against it there also persists the newer and yet more potent human motive is to have new confidence in the widening possibilities of "the process of the suns." M.